

# The CONFERENCE BULLETIN

PUBLISHED BY THE  
NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF SOCIAL WORK

Vol. 42

JULY, 1959

Number 4



GRACE L. COYLE

*The*  
*President*  
1939 - 1940



## THE CONFERENCE BULLETIN

OF THE

National Conference of Social Work  
82 North High Street, Columbus, Ohio

**President:** Grace L. Coyle, Cleveland, Ohio  
**Treasurer:** Arch Mandel, New York City  
**General Secretary and Editor of the Bulletin:**  
Howard R. Knight, Columbus, Ohio



JULY, 1939

Published four times a year by the National Conference  
of Social Work, January, April, July, and October  
Price fifty cents a year, fifteen cents a copy  
(Membership Directory, 25 cents)

Sent to all members in consideration of payment of fifty  
cents as part of membership fee.

Entered as second-class matter at Columbus, Ohio,  
March 21, 1921, under the Act of August 24, 1912. Ac-  
ceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided  
for in Section 1103 Act of October 3, 1917, authorized  
March 21, 1921.

## CONFERENCE OFFICERS

1939-40

**President**

GRACE L. COYLE  
Cleveland, Ohio

**First Vice-President**

ARLIEN JOHNSON  
Los Angeles, California

**Second Vice-President**

SIDNEY HOLLANDER  
Baltimore, Maryland

**Third Vice-President**

MRS. DEFOREST VAN SLYCK  
New York City

**Treasurer**

ARCH MANDEL  
New York City

**General Secretary**

HOWARD R. KNIGHT  
Columbus, Ohio

## THE JULY BULLETIN

	Page
SOCIAL WORK AND ITS DEMOCRATIC BASE, GRACE L. COYLE	3
POSTSCRIPT—BUFFALO, 1939 PAUL KELLOGG	5
BUFFALO—A GREAT MEETING	6
CONFERENCE ORGANIZATION, 1940	30

## Grace Abbott

**E**ARLY in Conference week at Buffalo came the news that Grace Abbott had passed on. Thus for the fourth time during the year the Conference mourns the loss of one of its great past Presidents. No one can measure the contribution which Grace Abbott has made to social work and through social work to human welfare during her life time. Because of her labors as Chief of the Children's Bureau, children in this country have and will continue to have a better chance of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Fearless, courageous, strong in her convictions, unsparing of herself, a strong leader in the fight for the good life has laid down her burden.

## The 1940 Meeting

**T**HE 1940 meeting of the National Conference of Social Work will be held in Grand Rapids, Michigan, May 26-June 1. Conference headquarters will be in the Convention Hall. The Pantlind Hotel will be headquarters hotel for the Conference. Headquarters hotels for the various Associate Groups will be announced in the January Bulletin.

At the meeting in Buffalo the Time and Place Committee reported that invitations for 1941 had been received from Boston, Massachusetts, and Atlantic City, New Jersey. Definite recommendations for the 1941 meeting will be made at Grand Rapids.

## Program Suggestions

**W**HILE it seems almost too soon to be thinking in terms of 1940, nevertheless the Program Committee of the Conference will start its work in September. Members of the Conference who have definite suggestions for program material for the 1940 meeting should send them to the Conference office before October 1. The Program Committee and the various Section Chairmen welcome such suggestions.

An effort will be made again this year to secure some organized discussion of program suggestions in various localities throughout the country. If members are asked to cooperate in this discussion, they should do so.

# SOCIAL WORK AND ITS DEMOCRATIC BASE

## The President of the Conference Looks Forward

By GRACE COYLE

THE Buffalo Conference opened in Paul Kellogg's keynote speech with a call to social pioneering which would adequately carry on the traditions of the settling of the west. And if one listened to the speeches and the conversations around lunch tables with an ear for the undertones, it seemed throughout to be permeated with a newly insistent note which re-echoed some of those traditions in a new form. The undertone rose clear and dominating in Dr. Alice Masaryk's final appeal to the Conference. This essential common note of the Buffalo Conference was a growing realization of the meaning of our basic democracy for all that we as social workers cherish for individuals and for communities.

Social work was born in the period when the frontier was closing and the new problems of a maturing capitalist democracy were making themselves evident. It has been maintained out of the surplus of our industrial system and has expressed the humanitarian impulse characteristic of our chaotic, impulsive, individualistic American society. While it has aspects which at times have been more feudal than democratic, social work has been dominated by that concern for the individual and his growth which is of the essence of the democratic creed. We, as social workers, have so taken this essence for granted that it has never

### The President

MISS GRACE COYLE, the new President of the Conference, is a graduate of Wellesley College and received her M.A. and Ph.D. degrees from Columbia University. Early in her career she did settlement work in New York and followed this with work in the coal mining region near Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania. For many years she was head of the National Industrial Department of the Young Women's Christian Association.

At present she is Professor of Group Work in the School of Applied Social Sciences at Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio. Thus she brings to the presidency of the Conference a wealth of experience in various fields of social work and proven leadership.

Her service to the Conference has been extensive. She was Chairman of the Group Work Section when it was initiated in 1935 and served two years. She has also served as First Vice-President of the Conference in 1937 and a member of the Committee on International Conference of Social Work. She has contributed many times to the program of the Conference and has been on the programs of a number of the Associate Groups. She has written extensively, her two chief contributions to social work literature being the books "Social Process in Organized Groups," and "Studies in Group Behavior."

The Conference can look forward to a year of steady progress under her leadership.

occurred to us until recently that it needed to be defended.

It was, therefore, a new call which came to us through one speech after another of this Conference. It is as if we had felt the tremor of the solid earth of our democratic assumptions and had been awakened to their meaning. Dr. Masaryk from her own cruel awakening stirred us to a profound realization of their significance.

What then will 1940 mean to us as social workers? What should the Grand Rapids Conference do for us in these precarious times? It depends much on the events of the crowded days which lie between us and that Conference.

In all the welter of problems with which we as social workers deal in our many organizations one major and recurrent problem continues to confront us. Unsolved and ominous

—the unemployment of ten million Americans. Bad as it is, we recognize it as only one symptom of the basic maladjustment of our economy whose other characteristics we know in low incomes, bad housing, preventable disease and the other familiar features of the social workers world. These we have dealt with since the Conference began. For the last ten years mass unemployment has dominated our landscape. We have seen our communities meet it first with bafflement, then with sym-



pathy, now perhaps with a tinge of weariness and scepticism. Through temporary and inadequate measures we have struggled to keep body and soul together on substandard budgets and have provided outlets for the frustrated and hopeless victim of a social catastrophe. We, like the unemployed themselves have had all we could do to keep our heads above the water of the flood, which engulfed our agencies and our communities.

1940 is an election year and the beginning of a new decade. The "emergency" threatens to stay with us and the reactions to ten years of social strain are beginning to make themselves felt. European experience should warn us that frustration and despair are cumulative and that continued unemployment especially among the young provide suitable tinder for the false fires of dictatorship. The weary and baffled taxpayer asks when there will be an end to this new burden. New racial animosities threaten to split our communities into hostile camps. Antagonisms between the growing strength of organized labor and the established power of organized capital flare up in industrial conflicts. Demagogues and their "shirted legions" spring up and get a following here and there. These are symptoms of the strain on our democratic institutions, which is creating a new environment for social work in 1940. If that democracy is to survive it must provide more adequate answers to human need than uncertain relief

for its families and a blind future for its young. What has social work to do with these answers?

The National Conference of Social Work and we as individuals must take cognizance of these signs of the times. In such a period social work must redefine its function. We cannot absorb overdoses in technicalities nor institutionalisms. While we must continue to grapple with our immediate problems we must concentrate our energies for the major issues that confront us. What have we to say today of the places where human life is threatened—of the new provisions for human welfare that must be developed? What is to be the relation of the social services to the organized state and to the pressures which are determining its course? We must redefine our conception of human well-being and our beliefs in human rights in our society. We must amplify and clarify our relation to those basic assumptions of a democratic society in which alone social work can fulfill its essential function. In these days of shifting social forces, we need to discover what other elements can be relied on to support and strengthen the common welfare of the common man which is our concern. The new decade may well require of us deeper insights and a new role in the creation of a more adequate democracy.

To this end, Grand Rapids may build upon the significant foundations of the Buffalo Conference.

### The 1939 Proceedings

THE Conference has just entered into a new contract with the Columbia University Press to publish the Proceedings for 1939. The Editorial Committee is meeting the last of July and we expect the finished volume about November 1.

The printed Proceedings goes to each member of the Conference whose membership fee is \$5.00 or more. Members wishing to have the Proceedings but whose membership fee does not provide for it now, can secure it by sending the additional \$2.00 to the Conference office up until September 15. Persons who are not members but who wish to purchase the Proceedings can do so by ordering them directly from the Columbia University Press, New York City.

### Fourth International Conference of Social Work

THE Fourth International Conference of Social Work will be held in Brussels, Belgium, July 15-20, 1940. An international summer school, similar to the one held just prior to the International Conference in London in 1936, will be held in con-

nection with the Conference in Brussels, July 8-13, 1940. Preliminary announcements of both the Conference and the Summer School will be available in the National Conference office after September 1.

### Evart G. Routzahn

THE Conference lost one of its most loyal friends when Evart Routzahn passed on. Few members realize the contribution that he has made to the Conference over the years both with his thoughtful advisory relationship to the staff and on committees and by his genial presence year after year at the annual meeting. Honest in his convictions, thoughtful, constructive and inspiring in his suggestions, generous in his praise for others and modest in claims for his own contribution, Evart Routzahn through the years has been one of the real forces that have helped to make the National Conference of Social Work of greater service each year to social work. We miss him.



## POSTSCRIPT: BUFFALO, 1939

By PAUL KELLOGG

SOMETHING like a curtain call, it seems, is expected from a president of the National Conference of Social Work. All of us who took part in the June meetings at Buffalo can now look back at them through the lattice of our everyday work.

The way they look to me is that we have created an extraordinary instrument for contact and exchange, for the stimulus that comes from hearing original experience, scientific foragings and the hail of creative leadership. Clearly we have put to use the values which come of a conference which has chosen to stick to its last as a mechanism for minds to meet. But contrariwise, the times we live in, playing a harsh light on our Buffalo meeting, showed how lame we are as social workers in developing implements for concerted action in our fields of work. And beyond that, how great are the gaps in the general front, professional and lay alike, of vigorous social concern.

This came over me a few days after my return when a Montessori teacher happened to sit opposite me at dinner at Henry Street Settlement. She had been an exile, first in Geneva and then in Minorca until the Spanish war overtook her there. Now she is in New York and was telling not of her own encounters with persecution or conquest, but of what had happened to two elderly aunts of hers who had stayed on in the Reich. The Nazi agents who visited them had, before they left, smashed into fragments a cabinet full of delicate China, heirlooms the family had treasured for three generations. They ran their knives quite as wantonly through the ancient leather of carved chairs in the living room and overturned the shelves of crockery in the kitchen. That, strangely enough, got me more than some of the authentic atrocities of which I have heard. It was like an intimate footnote to the self-imposed restraint of the overseas speaker at our final luncheon at Buffalo, who spoke in terms of her American observations, and only those, because the countrywide scheme of social work which she had built up in twenty years was like a hostage she must protect.

If that sort of thing is not going to happen here, it will be because we have strengthened our own democracy at home. Social workers are building defense lines in our daily work as truly as the English do when they dig trenches in the parks. But dugouts for safety's sake never won a war. There is call for salients of concerted and determined action if we are to count as we should.

We met at Buffalo with mass unemployment, like a footsore centipede, dragging its way into a

tenth year; with both emergency and long range measures stalling and backfiring at national and state legislatures; with democracy itself disparaged in the world at large as a way of life and work, anachronistic as a dirt road.

Nonetheless, to me a tough, affirmative spirit mantled the familiar trellis work of our Conference program, crowning the evening sessions, sending out fresh shoots in mornings set aside for our six main sections and (this year) a dozen special committees; and in afternoons given over to forty-nine associated groups and to impromptu meetings. This gave liveness and reach to a gathering which is much engrossed with techniques. It gave a sense of a recurrent and positive theme at Buffalo, due in part to correlated planning by the Conference committees, in part to scores of suggestions that Conference headquarters had long since elicited from the membership, and in part spontaneously to what Miss Addams once called "education by the current event." It was as if some inner spring against tiredness and disillusionment had recoiled among social workers themselves, who know people close-in the country over and who know what stirs them.

For my part, at the opening session I had spoken of the blend of individual initiative and team play which, we like to think, sprang alike from the settlement of my native middlewest. The thirty years which had elapsed since the preceding Conference in Buffalo (1909) had seen our new profession, as in the case of medicine and engineering, catch the fresh initiatives that come when a calling is crossed with science. Social case work, for example, drew on the discoveries of physicians, psychologists, psychiatrists and contributed in turn to those disciplines. That was team work; and even more was that mustering of forces by our pioneers who made common cause with progressive lawyers and doctors, business men, labor leaders, club women, teachers and the rest. Otherwise we would never have launched the preventive movements that have grappled with tuberculosis, child labor, housing, industrial accidents and the like.

Today we see current aspects of this process at work as other vocations are drawn into the new public welfare and security services. We see it in the current countrywide study of the Association of the Schools of Social Work into the need for all-around training in community relationships. We see it in the growing-pains of our American Association of Social Workers; in the rise of the service unions and the spread of unrestricted organizations such as the younger generation in

(Continued on Page 29)

## BUFFALO: A GREAT MEETING

**Many Innovations Introduced; Strengthening of America's Social Legislation Program Urged throughout June 18-24 Session; Registration Reaches 5,774**

**L**ET this point be underscored—the Buffalo meeting was a great meeting. Brimful of activity, packed with incisive sessions, sparkling and stimulating, the 66th annual meeting proved a fitting milestone to mark two-thirds of a century for the National Conference of Social Work.

Let this point be noted, too—had the Olympian Gods themselves planned it, no more equable weather could have been provided. A bright sun and the blissfully cool Lake Erie breezes added precisely the right touch to the week of June 18-24.

Revealed at every stage was the careful planning that had gone into the Conference program—planning that began in July, 1938, when the Conference dispatched a call for program suggestions to social workers individually and collectively throughout the country. And in addition, the special events of the week—and there were many—hit high marks all their own. The 5,774 registered delegates seemed virtually unanimous about that.

Many innovations marked the Buffalo Conference—such as the orientation meeting designed to help newcomers learn what it was all about; the laymen's dinner where laymen, addressing a lay audience, had their say about social work (and which produced one of the most applauded speeches of the week); the coaching service sponsored by the Social Work Publicity Council for new or timid speakers; the Past President Council dinner, designed to bring back into Conference thinking and planning the experience of the former leaders; the special general session Wednesday evening, scheduled at nearly the last minute as the only available time New York's Mayor Fiorello H. LaGuardia could address the Conference. There was something new, too, in the public airing of the discrimination question which spread like wildfire from "buzz-buzz" among Conference folk in the hotel lobbies and reached the country's newspapers three days before it had a chance to reach the Conference business session—with the result that the question of next year's meeting place virtually was settled before it reached the floor, and Grand Rapids won.

Several main currents developed. Scored and

re-scored was the point that there must be no backsliding in America's social legislation program. Resentment was displayed throughout the week toward the recently-passed House Bill which would emasculate the Works Progress Administration—coupled with a call for action among social workers of the nation to prevent similar action by the Senate. Need was stressed for a broadening of the Social Security Act—particularly to provide greater protection to dependent children. Demands for something better—and a whole lot better—for the migrants and the rural families were voiced. The urgent need to put more Americans back to work was stressed. Likewise, the call for integration among unemployment, relief and public work programs. Sound planning was advanced for a national health program which would make medical attention available to all who need it. And underlying the whole meeting was the subject of democracy—the recognition that to preserve democracy we must prepare to defend it against encroaching reaction and totalitarianism which are dangerously near.

The 66th annual meeting opened Sunday evening before more than 6,000 persons in Buffalo's Broadway Auditorium. Following a Boy Scout flag ceremony and the singing of "America the Beautiful," by the entire audience, the Rt. Rev. Msgr. John C. Carr of Buffalo read the invocation. Eugene Warner, chairman of the Buffalo Committee on Arrangements, who presided, welcomed the Conference on behalf of the social work community, and Mayor Thomas L. Holling of Buffalo extended his greetings. Edward L. Ryerson, Jr., president of the Chicago Community Fund and first vice-president of the National Conference of Social Work, introduced the speaker of the evening, Paul Kellogg.

**K**EYNOTING the week-long session, Mr. Kellogg spoke on, "Buffalo and Points West." Mr. Kellogg pointed out that the future of industry as well as of democratic citizenship rests upon the preservation of present social legislation and its expansion. He traced the rise of the social legislation now labeled as the New Deal back to the efforts of the National Conference thirty years ago and declared it is a mistake to regard these devel-

opments as the product of the present national administration.

He pronounced the Works Progress Administration an outstanding contribution to the American way and denounced proposed relief cuts as "stopping the salvage of sheer waste of workless human beings." Those who would "degrade or ditch" such measures, he declared, are neither Republicans nor Democrats, but reactionaries. He urged defense of the National Labor Relations Act against "raids" and the Wages and Hours Act against "having its teeth pulled." He also appealed for adoption of the national health program despite opposition of "the vested interests, beginning with the American Medical Association."

"If we throw out the Works Progress Administration," Mr. Kellogg declared, "we shall be scuttling the first promising demonstration that the American people have the wit to make use of idle workers and idle time in such a way as to produce needed services for the benefit of our common life . . . The WPA has been put over in emergency tempo, uncertain of its funds. I do not see that we need to assume that its larger wastes and hectic changes are either inherent or permanent."

"We have learned enough to get past emergency planning, if we will, to strip the WPA of the political binding cords that Congress has not seen fit to cut; to shift, stage by stage, from a loan to a tax basis; to cut down the burden—wherever, but only wherever, this will not defeat the main purpose; but to make that burden count as an unremitting pressure to bring livelihood back to normal."

"I should like to put the situation which threatens the footholds of our democracy in terms not of grievous social injury but of opportunity; or where we as social workers can take hold. If our pioneers had not made common cause with progressive lawyers, business men and club women, with labor leaders, physicians, teachers, we never would have launched those preventative movements after the turn of the century which have grappled with tuberculosis, child labor, bad housing, industrial abuses and the rest."

The next general session, Monday evening, introduced three speakers on the subject, "The Call of Our Great Traditions." They were: Dr. Solomon Lowenstein, executive vice-president of the Federation for the Support of Jewish Philanthropic Societies, New York City; George N. Shuster, associate editor of *The Commonweal*, Glenbrook, Conn., and Judge Florence E. Allen of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, Cleveland.

Dr. Lowenstein addressed a moving plea to America to show the world its "hatred for intolerance, bigotry and tyranny" by giving sanctuary to a proposed quota of 20,000 European refugee

children. These children, he said, come from every race and creed—and the suffering of the refugees in Europe is not in any sense a Jewish question primarily. His plea was made in the course of an address which espoused the traditions and heritage of the Jewish group in the United States as completely in accord with the common ideal of Americanism. Refuting the charge of Communism as dastardly and false, he traced the present social levels of the Jewish people in the United States out of the long history of suffering, persecution and migration before their liberation from the ghetto to their arrival in America.

"They brought with them," Dr. Lowenstein said, "a tradition of liberty and equality, of communal ideals and social justice comparable, and in largest degree similar to or identical, with the great tradition of America."

In his exposition of the Jewish contribution to American democracy, culture and tradition, he stressed the following points: 1. The Biblical precepts commanding respect for the rights of the poor, the widow, the fatherless, the aged and the under-privileged have been embedded in their hearts and minds for centuries. 2. The Jew came here free from any external domination of any kind and for him there was no divided allegiance in a political sense. 3. All Americans are in different degrees immigrants or children of immigrants and in this respect the Jew differs from no other portion of the American community. 4. The Jews show the same range of difference among themselves in every respect and in the same manner as all other American citizens stemming from any foreign background. 5. The charge that the Jewish group produces a disproportionate amount of communists is unjustified. 6. Their vocational distribution has been conditioned by their history in the countries from which they emigrated. 7. They have been active in all the social welfare programs of communities in which they have a representation and have borne their fair share of the cost.

Mr. Shuster, characterizing the United States as "a land of minorities," credited this country's amazingly good government since George Washington's time primarily to the "balance which exists between the minorities which make up the population."

"As a people," he said, "we have always quarrelled violently about everything, only to discover then that all parties to the quarrel had desires they could voice in unison. No mere coalition of minorities has ever prevailed here for very long. In short, you cannot rule this country on any important issue by appealing to the numerical majority alone. Nor can you shape its destinies by letting one compact minority ride roughshod



over the opposition. A ruse may succeed momentarily, but it will be exposed."

Discussing the composition of American minorities, Mr. Shuster said:

"I am impelled to believe that the permanent substance of our minorities is religious. It is because Catholic, Protestant and Jew clung to views of life endowed with permanent sacredness that the decision to defend views at all could awaken enthusiasm and summon forth resolution. They have quarreled plentifully and angrily; they have hurled fierce names at each other in the name of God; they have indulged in mutual slander and vituperation. But at the bottom all were agreed upon the right to believe, and therefore that right survived.

"A Catholic like myself may shake his head as he thumbs the pages of history and checks the hard words that were hurled at his ancestors; a Jew may look about him and marvel at the logic and linguistic inventiveness of the anti-Semite; the Protestant may gulp as his creed is glibly consigned to the scrapheap and his pretensions are pummelled. Nevertheless, a Catholic cannot do otherwise than be sincerely grateful to the Protestant for the uncompromising defense of religious freedom which he undertook; for without that defense, Catholics would never have been able to hold their ground. And every Jew understands that the principal guarantees of his continued liberation is the fact that Christians must of necessity keep the state untainted by attempts to subordinate the worship of God to the whims of majorities or minorities."

**JUDGE ALLEN** declared: "Our theory of government—our first great living tradition—is that it shall be not government by the official and for the official, by the politicians and for the politicians, by the rich and for the rich, but by the people and for the people. And we have really put to work the tradition that in this country government is to promote the general as opposed to the special welfare. It is a doctrine which we accept, that in our national life we share in a common enterprise to which we all contribute, the benefits of which are accessible to all. The tradition has been put to work with varying intelligence, directness and effect."

Stressing the unwavering importance of the Bill of Rights to the preservation of liberty and democracy, Judge Allen said:

"In the Bill of Rights for the first time in history, and to a degree never before stated, freedom of inquiry was guaranteed to every resident within our borders. But this great tradition has not been put to work extensively. It has been enforced in

ringing declarations in the Supreme Court, but in lower tribunals and in the hearts of the people, the First Amendment has not been properly enshrined. Never until police officers, mayors, legislators, governors, and plain citizens understand and believe in the First Amendment as an article of faith, will it be actually, as well as in the words of the instrument, the supreme law of the land.

"There are many laws much more universally enforced on behalf of the public than those embodied in the Bill of Rights. The traffic statutes and regulations furnish an excellent example. They are enforced not only in court but in general by all administrative officials, and by the public itself . . . Everyone understands them. The police officer, the motorist, the pedestrian, all realize the difference between the red and green light.

"But relatively few people understand that there is a green light in America for the peaceable expression of opinion not only for themselves but also for others who violently disagree with them on crucial questions, and this lack of public understanding is the underlying cause of our occasional non-enforcement of civil rights."

In the spotlight at the next general session, Tuesday evening, was the subject, "Health Ahead—A National Program." Miss Josephine Roche, chairman of the President's Interdepartmental Committee to Coordinate Health and Welfare Activities, presided. Miss Helen Hall, director of the Henry Street Settlement, discussed the subject from the standpoint of "When Sickness Strikes." A paper prepared by Dr. Thomas Parran, surgeon general of the United States Public Health Service, on "The Right to Health—and How to Win It," was read for him in his absence by Dr. Clifford E. Waller, assistant surgeon general. The death of his father prevented Dr. Parran's attendance.

"Definitely it may be said that the year has brought progress toward health," declared Miss Roche, "and from now on our thinking and discussion should be concerned not so much with planning and programs as with action for national health, action which will release from its present paper status a far-reaching, soundly conceived health program and make it a functioning reality for the millions so desperately needing what it can give . . . In our general advance toward social and economic security we must not permit the health front to lag, not only because health in itself is of transcendent importance to the nation, and is the right of the individual millions who make up the nation, but also because progress on all social and economic fronts will be retarded and halted unless the human and economic waste of our unmet health needs is eliminated.

"Our self-governing people have voiced in no uncertain terms in recent years their conviction

that human welfare—human conservation—is the first concern of, the first charge on government.”

In her address, Miss Hall pointed out that two-thirds of the low income families in American cities, struggling to pay their debts, are without a family doctor, in fact worse off than families on relief. She pictured a distressing need for compulsory health insurance and urged the active support of social workers for the Wagner Health Act. One study made in New York and another conducted in 23 cities of 16 states, she said, showed that only about one-third of the families of low wage earners had family doctors and that a “similar case study of rural families would certainly present a picture even more devastating in its inadequacies.”

“Title 13 of the Wagner Bill makes it possible for the Federal government to reinforce through grants in aid a state plan for compulsory health insurance, each state being left to act according to its own problems and convictions,” she continued. “The Federal Act does provide for cash benefits for time lost through sickness even though the question of medical care is left for state action. What we must remember is that the states will not act unless there is leadership in our communities, and what group has a better background from which to act than ours?”

Discussing the persons who would benefit from a compulsory health insurance program, Miss Hall said:

“In considering sickness, there are to my mind roughly four groups in the population—first, the dependent group who must have entirely free medical care. Where there is well administered home relief with provisions for medical care, this group is better off than those just above the relief level. A doctor, as well as the services of a visiting nurse, is available to every family on relief in New York. The next group up to perhaps \$3,000 a year, is self-supporting but is not able as a whole to meet the full cost of medical care. This is the group which should be cared for by compulsory insurance through which the cost of their care could be shared and spread. There is a third group which can pay for full medical and nursing care but in order to do this successfully must also spread the cost. This can be done through insurance in voluntary medical and hospital associations. Then there is that fortunate fourth group which does not have to consider the financial aspects of medical care, which has only the task of choosing the physician, the nurse, and the hospital they prefer. The Wagner Act has no concern for them except as they must share its costs through taxation or if they are citizens who feel a responsibility for the well-being of the whole community.”

Pointing out that “the National Health Program represents the most comprehensive approach ever

made towards solving the diverse and serious problems retarding our nation's health,” Dr. Par-ran's paper named its five objectives as follows:

“Its first objective is to reduce drastically the volume of sickness and ill health by making available to all areas and all groups of the population needing service, the proven methods of prevention—prevention of death of mothers and babies; a nation-wide attack on tuberculosis and the venereal diseases; promotion of industrial hygiene; the use of proven methods to lessen the burden of mental illness, and the practical eradication of malaria which lays such a heavy burden upon large areas of the South.

“Second, the National Health Program provides aid for the construction and maintenance of hospitals, though only where needed, and for the support of existing hospitals, public and private alike, especially in the distressed and rural areas . . . The third objective is to reduce disability and lengthen life by more prompt and adequate medical care of the sick . . . Fourth, through the proposal of temporary disability insurance, indirect health protection would be extended to the worker and his family by compensation for wages lost through non-industrial sickness and accident causing temporary incapacity. Finally, and most important, greater Federal effort is proposed for research, that we may learn how to prevent and cure diseases not now controllable.”

**I**N order to address the special general session Wednesday evening, Mayor LaGuardia flew from New York to Buffalo, arriving only two hours before he spoke. Then almost immediately after his appearance, he rushed back to Washington, D. C., to appear the following day before the Senate Committee on Appropriations on behalf of the WPA. Mr. LaGuardia's Conference address originally was scheduled for Friday night. However, when unforeseen emergencies forced him to cancel that arrangement, the extra general session was added—and the Mayor spoke to almost a full house nevertheless. The re-arrangement forced the Social Work Publicity Council Follies to set back its Wednesday night starting time an hour but the Follies, too, played to a full house, with standees, which saved the day for all concerned!

Mayor LaGuardia made a fiery defense of the Works Progress Administration; he cited the need for adjustment in old-age pension laws to keep persons approaching the retirement age from suffering; he urged uniform child labor laws throughout the United States, and he called for a broadening of unemployment insurance laws to bring all workers under the system.

“We are a great democracy now,” he declared. “We have established individual freedom, freedom



of the seas, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, freedom of religion—but, my friends, you can't enjoy these freedoms on an empty stomach. And there is no use boasting about our freedom unless we provide economic security for all the people so that they have the fullest measure of enjoyment of the freedom that our form of government can give to every individual.

"When there are from 8,000,000 to 10,000,000 unemployed, there is no time for debating. It is all right to find the solution. I am heartily in accord with providing a way to put these people back to gainful employment, but in the meantime these people must be looked after, must be aided. And I believe the American way of giving aid to the unemployed is to provide work for them so that they can earn enough to support their families and maintain the dignity and self-respect of an American citizen. I mention that this evening because at this very moment that American system of aiding the unemployed is threatened."

Referring to the prolonged period of unemployment, Mayor LaGuardia said: "You hear the question very often asked, 'How long is this thing going to last?' and the answer is, 'It is going to last until we find a solution.' The responsibility of finding that solution is not with you, but it is your responsibility to see that those people who are destitute through no fault of their own, that their families are maintained together, that their children get proper and sufficient nourishment and that they are kept alive in the meantime."

"It is a responsibility of those entrusted with government, under our system, to find that solution. I do not think it can be done overnight, but I do not want to think that the morale of the American people has been spoiled. I do not want to see any economic system brought about, by reason of the destitution of several million American citizens, that would destroy everything that they have accomplished in the last 150 years."

Referring to other social legislation, Mayor LaGuardia said: "We have started a system of old-age pensions. That should have been done 25 years ago. That will take care of a group of superannuated workers at one end of the line; but we must bring about some sort of adjustment or else you will find that citizens approaching the retirement age will suffer. It is necessary to bring about uniformity in the allowances . . . On the other end of the line we need uniform child labor laws throughout the United States . . . In between we have now faced the problem of unemployment insurance. That has to be broadened in order to bring all workers under the system . . . With unemployment insurance, old-age pensions and child labor laws we will remove a large percentage of the men and women who now find themselves on the relief or WPA rolls."

The general session Friday evening introduced two speakers: Paul J. Kern, president of the New York Municipal Civil Service Commission, and Miss Josephine Wilkins of the Coordinating Committee of Atlanta, President of the Georgia League of Women Voters and a member of the Coordinating Committee of the Citizen's Fact Finding Movement of Georgia.

Speaking on "Ancient Spoils and Modern Public Services," Mr. Kern urged social workers to go into politics to protect their operations from retrenchment.

"I gravely and earnestly urge upon you," said Mr. Kern, "contrary to all milk-and-water theories of social work, that you become active in politics. If enlightened social agencies of government do not destroy the corrupt and reactionary political machine these machines will destroy democratic social agencies. I witnessed with you the blundering and pathetic ignorance of old-line politicians as America plunged into the deep abyss of 1929, but these old-line politicians were not mortally stricken; they were only stunned. Now they are back with us again, demanding the end of WPA, the destruction of social agencies of government, demanding mass starvation, human degradation and institutionalized misery. Democratic America cannot withstand forever the despair and disillusionment of such official betrayal."

Discussing the conflict of civil service with political appointments, Mr. Kern declared, "the cold, impartial and hard-hearted competitive examination is the only assurance we have of equality and democracy in public employment. No political machine operating on a patronage basis can ever operate successful social agencies."

In her address on "Facts Versus Folklore—An Adventure in Democracy," Miss Wilkins said American democracy has arrived at "the dangerous age" and "we cannot neglect liberty as we have and at the same time expect to hold her."

Warning that, "In this challenge to democracy, do not take too lightly my region," Miss Wilkins reminded her audience that the Ku Klux Klan, the Silver Shirts and the Knights of the White Camellia are there and that two-thirds of the people in Georgia are without land. "Half of these landless are a dispossessed, hopeless people," she said, "moving yearly from farm to farm. In cities, around industrial plants, others are equally as hopeless. Is it not natural that they should listen when new hope is promised? They have followed demagogues. Until their lot is better, they will follow demagogues again. Do not take too lightly my region."

The South has not yet had its inning, Miss Wilkins declared, and has remained in a colonial status for these many years. Some way must be found, she said, whereby part of the wealth, long drained from the South, can be replaced. "It must



be done for the good of the nation as a whole; for the good of the other regions as well as the South," she said. "For the South is the new market; the new frontier."

Miss Wilkins told of Georgia's new adventure in democracy through its Citizen's Fact Finding Movement; an undertaking for the study of the state and its eventual improvement through the democratic process. In a region where the habit of looking backwards has compensated "a proud people humiliated through defeat," she said, the state of Georgia decided to look realistically at itself and set up the Movement. It was launched in 1937, she asserted, when a group of Georgia citizens determined to find out why a region with natural resources, fine climate and population remains the poorest in the country. Seventeen state-wide organizations, nearly all with local affiliated groups were brought together in the Movement to make a combined membership of 250,000 persons. Twelve subjects, including natural resources, health, education, Federal activity and religious, civic and social forces, were selected for factual study and experts in these subjects were chosen to prepare the reports on the basis of information obtained under the collective plan. When the inventory was completed on the basis of the first year's program, Miss Wilkins said, three-quarters of the people who answered a query, asked that the work be continued, and the current program of the Movement is based on this demand.

**A**N overflow crowd jammed the Hotel Statler Ballroom—main floor and balcony—to hear Miss Alice G. Masaryk address the final Conference luncheon, and to applaud her resoundingly. Miss Masaryk, first president of the International Conference of Social Work and daughter of the late Thomas G. Masaryk, first president of Czechoslovakia, came to the United States especially to speak before the Buffalo meeting, and she had landed here from London only a few days earlier. Her subject was "Current Bearings of the World Crisis."

"I am impressed by the large number united here in a common aim, in a world torn into fragments by hostility," she said. "This unity of yours is indeed more needed than ever; not a mechanical outward union, but a deeply rooted feeling of brotherhood and sisterhood among all social workers of the United States. It is a joy to see what a spirit prevails among you. The country needs you and the world needs your country. It needs your optimism, good will, your free spirit."

"I found in the course of the Conference the one basis possible for healthy social development—the constructive principles of love, explained, developed and deepened by scientific research. This

is why I feel sure that with time your honest work will bring about the understanding, that only if individual needs of people and individual families living in villages, towns and great cities are thoroughly understood and their interests put first, production and economics will be more steady and politics more sound. It will take a great deal of quiet research on your part and a great deal of study and courageous thinking before the unhealthy sides of the economic system will be so clearly traced and understood that everybody will welcome a betterment. You social workers have here a great economic mission; by your understanding you can protect the society and prevent many a disaster.

"Surely," continued Miss Masaryk, "the best system and mass production have brought great advantages to our society; it has enabled broader classes to enjoy clothes, shoes, cars—things which used to be the monopoly of a few. But on the other hand, if I leave out the fact that it has ruined the lives of hundreds of splendid craftsmen, and that it brought unhealthy one-sidedness to the lives of working men—for these facts are understood and met—they cast another more serious shadow. The heightened and more complicated fight for distant markets is a dangerous by-product of the harnessed steam and electricity. We are all thankful for the greatness of the gifts science has brought to us, and if we would grow spiritually as well as we did grow in the field of science, we would find a way out of our crisis."

Concluding, Miss Masaryk declared: "I beg you social workers to make the step that leads forward understandable to everybody; your work, your experience, your exact information can bring a great deal of clearness. Being capable of solving your own problems soundly, you will help Europe, and by helping Europe you will help us Czechoslovaks."

Not accorded the status of general sessions—but each wielding a punch of its own—were two special events held during Conference week. One was the Laymen's dinner, Tuesday, when Sidney Hollander of Baltimore and Edward L. Ryerson, Jr., of Chicago spoke. The other was a special coast-to-coast broadcast, Thursday (one of eight network broadcasts during the week) on the question, "How Are We Going to Put More Americans Back to Work?" The radio program, carried by the National Broadcasting Company, was conducted as a panel discussion with Paul Kellogg acting as moderator; the other speakers being William Hodson, commissioner of Welfare of New York City; Miss Josephine Wilkins of Atlanta; Representative Jerry Voorhis of California, and Miss Jane M. Hoey, director of the Department of Public Assistance of the Social Security Board.

In a blistering speech which he titled, "Confessions of a Board Member," Mr. Hollander fired

both barrels of his caustic wit into the ranks of laymen in social work. A member of the Board of State Aid and Charities of Maryland, second vice-president of the National Conference of Social Work, and officer and board member of a number of other organizations, Mr. Hollander told his audience of laymen that with "millions of people wretched and hopeless" they have "fallen down" on the job.

He told them that relief conditions as a whole throughout the country would make "chaos seem orderly by comparison;" that they didn't need "stuffed shirts" but men and women on their boards; that "social work cannot continue to salvage the ship-wrecked without trying to harness the tides;" that the unemployed are being kicked "around from pillar to post in a vain effort to pass the buck." He described philanthropy as the "very small tail of a very sick dog" and said "as long as present maladjustments exist, all that social work can do is mere patch work—a slapping on of a bandage here, a plaster there, never adequate enough to cover the festering sores that break through." He admonished laymen not to forget "what happened in other lands where millions were hungry and without hope" and pointed out that "the most successful step the dictators have taken are their assurances of regular work to every employable person."

Laymen in social work, Mr. Hollander declared, must take a stand "even at the risk of offending those whose main concern is with taxes" and must realize that the most valuable of all our resources is man—"for," he added, "men are husbands, men are fathers, men are citizens, men are our neighbors, men are America. Until their needs are met, America's budget will never balance."

Dealing with current assaults on public social services, Mr. Hollander said: "Tales of extravagance and dishonesty fill the press; funds that at best were never adequate have been diverted or squandered; eligibility depends less on need and more and more on the approval of some local boss. The wrath of the taxpayers is mounting—but against whom is it directed? Not against the politicians who have debauched the programs; not against the administrators who have degraded it—but against their helpless victims. The clients bear the brunt as always . . . There are flaws in the program—plenty of them—but what branch of our government is free from flaws? There's waste, too; it's inescapable in any plan that has to deal with millions of human beings no more ethical than the rest of us. But there's waste in the army, too. There's waste in the navy. Heaven knows there's waste in Congress and in the Legislatures, but are we suggesting that soldiers and sailors be thrown out on their ears or that Congress and the Legislatures be abolished?"

In his address on "Amateurs and Professionals," Mr. Ryerson, president of the Community Fund of Chicago, urged a better mutual understanding and closer relationship between groups represented by professional social workers and laymen. He said: "With the emphasis that we find today on professional work and the strong tendency in the direction of development of social work under governmental control, there has arisen in some quarters an attitude that hereafter lay participation in social work will be of little importance. I contend that such an approach to the problem is not justified, even if we might go so far as to assume that all social work may be under government control."

**S**AID Mr. Hodson about putting more Americans back to work: "No intelligent person believes that the able-bodied unemployed of America prefer living in idleness on relief to a decent job at decent wages. No intelligent person believes that relief solves the economic and industrial problems of our day. What all intelligent people do believe is that when jobs are not available people who are without any resources of their own must have some kind of public assistance . . . There is no blinking the fact that America must face a permanent relief program for those who are unable to work, because of illness or other physical or mental incapacity. We shall also have to take care of those who may be temporarily out of work, because we shall always have some unemployment, even in the best of times . . . Relief must always be available to those who have no other resources, and so we must have a permanent program, but one which should expand or contract as business conditions improve or decline.

"The unemployed must have purchasing power in order to live. If they can't get wages, then relief must be given to them, so that they may buy the necessities of life for themselves and their families. So long as they are able to buy the necessities of life the retailers and the small business men are able to dispose of their stocks, to remain in business, and keep their workers employed. If relief were suddenly denied to those who have no work and no income, just imagine what would happen to our economy . . . What would happen to small business all over the country, and large business, too, if purchasing power was suddenly taken away from millions of customers and no other means of livelihood provided?"

Said Miss Wilkins, from the standpoint of whether industrialization of the South will help or hinder: "Industrialization of the South will under some conditions help to put Americans back to work, while under other conditions it will definitely hinder . . . The South's vast natural resources and its mild climate would make it ideally adapted to industrialization if artificial deterrents, such as



freight rate differentials, were removed. Industrialization of the South could produce in the region a healthy balance between agriculture and industry. However, with industry subsidized through the American tariff, such a balance is not possible until some comparable subsidy is made available to agriculture. If the South is industrialized through the investment of money which is now in circulation, it will undoubtedly help to put Americans back to work. On the other hand, if the South is industrialized through the transfer to the South of existing industries, the chances are, it will definitely hinder . . .

"America cannot solve its unemployment situation for more than short periods until: (1) sufficient buying power is created through industrial wages and farm income to permit the purchase of products produced; (2) information is made available to the rank and file of the people which will permit them to adapt the size and quality of their families to the employment opportunities of a machine age."

Said Mr. Voorhis, from the standpoint of whether there is a democratic way out of unemployment: "The following five measures which, in my opinion, Congress should take now would, I believe, give us a democratic way out of unemployment."

"First, simplify and improve our tax laws. We are raising too much revenue by taxes on consumers and active business—money that people spend and invest. We are not raising enough revenue by taxes on individual incomes, inheritances, gifts, or values created by society. And we have not yet devised what may be the most necessary tax of all—a special tax on hoarded income—that is, income neither spent nor invested currently . . . My second measure is the development of the machinery whereby government can act to maintain a general even flow of consumer demand. This must include a national system of pensions to those who have reached the age where industry no longer will hire them, plus a complete social security system of benefits to dependent children, the disabled and other groups which clearly cannot and ought not be employed . . . Third, we should forget about so-called emergency measures and work out a long-term program of public works which will be primarily a program of governmental investment . . . Fourth, make the now privately owned twelve Federal reserve banks government institutions and use them as they always should have been used, as government banks of issue . . . Finally, we have a job to do in restoring opportunity for the small businessman in America . . . Either we must require of monopoly full production at reasonable prices with fair guarantees against loss or else, if we would find a democratic way out of unemployment, we must take measures to restore competi-

tive conditions wherever and on as fair terms as to the giant corporations."

Said Miss Hoey, from the standpoint of how social legislation can help: "I do not believe that the solution (to the problem of returning workers to jobs in private industry) can be left wholly up to either private industry or government. Creating job opportunities and maintaining them at a reasonably adequate level is primarily a problem for industry. But this alone will not reduce appreciably the tremendous backlog of accumulated unemployment. Men long out of work need help in locating jobs and in equipping themselves to fill them. Here government can—and does—contribute . . . We can never rescue the 'lost battalions' of the jobless until we get a comprehensive nationwide program that combines job guidance and adjustment with physical and vocational rehabilitation . . .

"I believe that, in addition to the social legislation now in operation, government may well give increasing concern to the regeneration of those whom unemployment has robbed not only of opportunity, but also of their skills, their health and their morale. The conservation of our man power is an objective worthy of our united effort as a nation."

THE program of the Social Case Work Section, organized under the direction of Florence R. Day, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, chairman, opened with a session devoted to the question: Are the principles of democracy and case work compatible in the administration of public assistance?

Dorothy Kahn speaking on "Democratic Principles and Public Assistance" stated, "Much is said about how democracy must be made to work. It is easy to see how this is done in relation to certain issues like freedom of speech, freedom of the press, or assembly. It is not so easy to see how it is done in applying that other less contested guarantee of our liberties—namely, the pursuit of happiness. Yet, this last is the special area of the social worker. Has our preoccupation with the individual led us unconsciously into an anarchistic philosophy that sees the needy person inevitably at war with the society of which he is a part, finding happiness only at the risk of happiness for others? Or have we discovered, through the experience of meeting mass need, a new kind of rational relationship between the so-called welfare of the individual and the welfare of society? If it is the first of these, then democracy and public assistance are unrelated and we have nothing to discuss. If it is the second, as I believe it is, then we are called upon to explain, illustrate and defend our findings until



they become as much a part of popular knowledge as the theory of the circulation of the blood."

In closing she said, "It is a common distortion of the concept of the uses of case work skill to believe that case work takes place only when the individual is treated therapeutically in some social disability or emotional situation. Yet there is no more challenging social disability or emotional situation than that of loss of self-maintenance. To me, there is no greater therapy than that which uses the democratic principles underlying the social function of government to help individuals to free themselves from the spiritual disfranchisement of dependency. When this happens, democratic principles have been put to work."

Phyllis Hill, former director of Public Assistance of the Florida State Welfare Board, speaking on "Case Work in Follow-up Service," said that the size and extent of the relief loads of social workers have of themselves precipitated better social attitudes. She declared heavy relief loads have prevented public agency workers from assuming a great deal of responsibility for planned treatment and workers have had no time to superimpose their plans. Because of this, "responsibility and activity have been centered in the client rather than in the worker or the agency . . . If this is so, has not the size of case loads contributed to the performance of case work rather than operated against it?"

Under a discussion of the field's part in teaching case work to the professional school students, Jeanette Regensburg, assistant professor of social case work, School of Social Work, Tulane University, spoke from the viewpoint of a public agency. Under good administration, Miss Regensburg said, the public assistance agency affords abundant opportunity for the instruction and practice of social case work students. Public assistance agencies, however, are primarily concerned with social case work teaching revolving about relief giving, she added, and stated that she believes students can develop professionally in the public agency as well as in a private agency training experience.

Lorna Sylvester, case supervisor, The Family Society, Wilmington, Del., spoke on the same subject from the standpoint of a private agency in a small city. She commented: "Supervision now has direction, goals and limits and has become a teaching process. The supervisor's first and primary responsibility is teaching the student, but she can be most helpfully and thoroughly responsible in this area only when she assumes two other responsibilities; that is, to the agency and to the professional school."

Two papers were presented analyzing the importance of a continuous supervision for the experienced case worker, by Dorothy Engel, case supervisor, Detroit Consultation Bureau, and Minnie

Alper, superintendent of Child Welfare Services, Missouri Social Security Commission, Jefferson City.

"The most thorough training in the classroom and in the field cannot prepare us for all of the infinite variety of human ills which we meet in our practice," said Mrs. Engel. "The supervisor aids the worker not only through her own greater breadth of experience, but also through the experiences of other case workers with whose work she has been in contact."

Discussing the subject from a rural viewpoint, Miss Alper stated that professional social work is on trial in the rural areas where the "trained expert" is ousting the volunteer. "The old order of meeting need through the efforts of interested volunteers is passing, but not without a struggle on the part of most communities," she said. "Often the paid worker, whether he has training or not, is considered a social worker and the public is searching for the skill which makes him superior to the displaced volunteer. The supervisor through the aid which she may give in improving and developing the worker's way of meeting situations helps the worker to meet a little better the expectations of the community for a 'trained expert'."

Discussing the aged person in the family setting under the general topic, "New Concepts in Case Work Practice with the Aged," Katharine Van de Carr, general case supervisor, Monroe County Welfare Department, Rochester, N. Y., advocated consideration of indigent old folks in terms of the family rather than isolating them as individual cases to be ignored or even rejected. "Even though we are prepared in our thinking and training for family case work," she observed, "there are forces without and within the agency set-up to care for the aged which seem to emphasize the care of the elderly person alone."

Speaking on the future of the juvenile court as a case work agency, Alice Scott Nutt, assistant director, Delinquency Division, U. S. Department of Labor, said juvenile courts should not be expected to do crime prevention work. "The delinquent, dependent or neglected child cannot be dealt with as an isolated bit of humanity," she said. "The seeds of his misconduct, social maladjustment or neglect were sown in the inadequacies and insecurities of his family life and nurtured by the deficiencies of the community's provision for health, educational and recreational services."

Three speakers discussed programs in children's institutions which are planned to meet the needs of the individual child based on continuous study of the child before admission and of his developments during and after his institutional stay. They were: Kate Bullock, director of case work, Connie Maxwell Orphanage, Greenwood, S. C.; M. Ingeborg Olsen, case worker, Albany Home for Child-

ren, Albany, N. Y., and Mrs. Alexander T. Sperry, supervisor of case work, Woodfield Children's Village, Bridgeport, Conn.

Miss Bullock told how her institution turned from mass treatment of children to individual care and revolutionized the work of its staff. When the experiment of individualization was begun, she said, "social workers were considered rather vague staff members whose work was away from the institution." At that time, she explained, each department functioned as a separate entity with no relationship to other departments. Despite many difficulties that hindered the experiment at the start, she said, the general purposes and aims of case work became known and accepted by the entire staff. "Individual case conferences are now possible, and a child's needs can be discussed objectively, before admission."

Good institutional service supplemented by foster homes makes a workable combination in planning for care and placement of children, Miss Olsen said. "Finding the right home for each child calls for careful study of the child and the foster family," she asserted. "As honest an interpretation as is possible should precede him to the foster home and when problems arise, it is essential that we take into consideration the foster family's reasons for reacting as they have. Case work with the foster mothers themselves or the families to whom a child returns from institutional care, must be recognized as an important aspect of the work."

Mrs. Sperry declared that case work should be used diligently by child caring institutions. "By actually taking care of children," she said, "we have learned that it is only theoretically possible to be impersonal and professional. Certainly with anything as earthy, as continually active and thought-provoking as a group of fifty healthy young human beings, our only hope of successful treatment is through establishing a personal relationship."

Discussing some basic underlying factors in case work-group work cooperation, Mrs. Ray Wechsler, director of Women's Activities, Bronx Young Men's and Young Women's Hebrew Association, New York City, reviewed the activities and discussed the personnel of the three-year-old committee originally established by the Welfare Council of New York City to study case work-group work relationships. Pointing out that both the case workers and group workers on the committee found the experience invaluable, Mrs. Wechsler said the committee recommended that similar work be carried on in neighborhood or regional conferences in order that an avenue be provided for better understanding of the scope and function of the services of all agencies involved.

A paper prepared by Mary Hester, supervisor, Institute of Family Service, and Dorothy Good Thomas, former director of girl's work, Alta House Settlement, both of Cleveland, reported on a cooperative project between group workers and case workers carried out under the auspices of the Cleveland Welfare Federation and the Alta House Settlement. Out of the project, Miss Hester and Mrs. Thomas found that six factors by which this working relationship could be carried out are necessary. They are: 1. Recognition that group workers and case workers have common objectives and are working toward the same end; 2. group workers and case workers are on common ground in that they are serving the same communities and many of the same kinds of people; 3. the assumption of a basic philosophy common to the profession of social work and shared by workers in both fields; 4. the focus of attention and effort on the individual and not upon a service to the other agency or the workers in it; 5. a feeling of respect for, and confidence in, the effectiveness of the contribution of one's own field; 6. an appreciation and respect for the contribution of the other's work which results in a wish to learn about it.

Leon Richman, superintendent, Foster Home Department, Jewish Children's Bureau, and Margaret Svendsen, Recreation Service, Institute of Juvenile Research, both of Chicago, reported jointly on a project carried on under auspices of the Chicago Council of Social Agencies. A number of case work agencies and summer groups participated, the speakers said. "In Chicago, as possibly in other communities where workers have gained an appreciation of the supplementary contributions which case work and group work can make to the individual development," the speakers said, "an increasing number of workers expressed the desire for orientation in both fields. In the final analysis, the interest in relating case work and group work more vitally is that improved service to the client or the participant may be rendered."

Discussion of the effect of cultural influences on the lives of individuals, the psychological processes that operate in individuals of different cultures and how case work treatment deals with these factors, introduced a paper by Elise de la Fontaine, associate district secretary, Community Service Society of New York City. Speaking of case work treatment with the Irish, Miss de la Fontaine declared that despite centuries of great economic deprivations, frustrations in self-government and education, all Irishmen still have marked pride in being Irish. This concept, on the part of social case workers, is vital to the understanding, diagnosis and case work treatment of Irish clients, she said. Miss de la Fontaine's report was based on a study of 25 cases of Irish born clients.

Dealing with, "Case Work and Community Change," Alice D. Taggart, district secretary, Com-



munity Service Society, New York City, said that to meet present threats of financial curtailment, social workers, who have learned how to help troubled people, must explain themselves and their services to the lay public. "To be sustained," Miss Taggart asserted, "our services must first be understood and valued by the every day citizen. Somehow, we must help the taxpayer and the voluntary contributor to believe wholeheartedly that we have services to give that are as vital to them as to us."

Eleanor Cockerill, director of Social Service, Long Island College Hospital, Brooklyn, N. Y., related a long case history which illustrated the value of current case work concepts in helping to treat physical illness. "It seems probable that many patients who seek the aid of a medical agency could utilize this kind of assistance," she commented. "The important role played by attitudinal factors in the acceptance or rejection of medical treatment cannot be minimized because their influence may ultimately determine whether or not the patient can avail himself of what the medical agency has to offer."

Dealing with the subject of the use of case work concepts where there is physical illness, from the standpoint of the case worker in the social agency, Susan Foulke Yocum, case worker, The Family Society, Philadelphia, said: "Our new understanding of the interrelationship of emotion and illness gives us a new responsibility to our physically ill clients. The first responsibility is to determine by referral to clinic or private doctor whether medical care is needed. The second, is to see that the doctor has some picture of 'the patient as a person.' After this, there is the interpretation to the client of something of the pattern of his illness, and then there is the regular case work job of helping the client adjust to his reality circumstances, in a way that is satisfactory to himself and the community."

Relating a lengthy case history, Louise Silbert, social case worker and supervisor of students, Psychiatric Department, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, illustrated how a detailed study of the client's current mode of behavior not only orients the case worker to the personality she is dealing with and his needs, but also suggests what form her work will take in the individual administrative setting she is in.

Speaking on "Treatment of Dependency," Edith Holloway, case supervisor, Family Service Association, Washington, D. C., related two detailed histories from her records illustrating the objective of stimulating the client toward greater responsibility. Discussing the skills with which the case worker should be equipped, Miss Holloway said: "It is not enough that the worker be equipped to use one method or another. If successful results

are to be achieved, the kind of treatment to be used must be determined by the nature of the client's problem—not by what the worker happens to be equipped to do. Moreover diagnostic skill, which is the foundation of treatment in every case, requires the fullest possible knowledge and objectivity."

A discussion of our present culture and the problems it creates for the adolescent closed the social case work section program. Donaldine Dudley Shilkin, case worker, Family Society, Philadelphia, discussed "Some Experiences of a Case Worker."

"Culturally," said Mrs. Shilkin, "we have the phenomenon of adolescence being prolonged or shortened according to the readiness of society to accept a new influx of responsible members who must find the means of support to establish homes or families . . . Viewed from any angle, adolescence is definitely constructive in tendency. Its characteristics are flexibility, plasticity, resiliency, whereas the environment against which it reacts is unyielding, formed, determined. In this difference lies the seat of the so-called 'adolescent revolt.'"

**T**HE Social Work Group Section program, arranged under the chairmanship of Lucy P. Carner of the Council of Social Agencies, Chicago, opened with a meeting devoted to the problems of "depression youth."

Speaking on "The Group Work Agency and the Young Adult," Owen R. Lovejoy, associate director of the American Youth Commission, Washington, D. C., said America's youth no longer blindly accepts the leadership of age. "This is an age of inquiry," he declared. "Youth—no longer content to fill the role of the obedient pupil—is undertaking to ask some questions himself and to put us and our institutions on the spot. This is a situation which should put us on our mettle, but also inspire our hope and our enthusiasm."

"Our young people have discovered leaders among themselves," he continued. "They have given expression to new and bold methods of meeting political and economic problems that have long baffled mature 'practical men' or savants. They have scoffed at some of the idols and sacred cows of orthodox business practice and moral codes—both public and personal." Despite a rising vocalism among the youth of the nation, America has no need to fear radicalism from that quarter, Mr. Lovejoy said, stating: "There appears slight cause for concern about the radical tendencies of youth. If any have ceased to take our mature wisdom without a grain of skepticism (observing the mess in which the mature population of this generation has allowed the world to get involved) and reply



to some of our traditional platitudes about the sure-fire effectiveness of diligence, honesty, loyalty and thrift with 'Oh, yeah!' and 'So what!' or even by a few radical outbursts here and there, extensive inquiry into the attitudes of American youth presents convincing evidence that in general they are bewildered, uninformed, not interested in the major problems that rock the nations of the world and have no decided opinions on what they believe, think or desire."

Clara A. Kaiser, professor, New York School of Social Work, in a discussion of experiences of group work agencies with the youth group, pointed out how "too often agency programs do not reflect sufficient flexibility in method and content so that they may be adapted to changing social forces and needs." She cited seven "necessary conditions in agency functioning if the needs of young adults are to be more effectively served," as follows: "1. We must have creative and imaginative workers on the staffs of our agencies, who can win the confidence of young people and provide convincing and resourceful leadership; 2. we must recognize the need for flexibility in the scope and content of programs; 3. we must provide opportunity for real participation of the young adult members in the determination of program and policies of the agency; 4. we must modify attitudes regarding standards of social and individual behavior imposed by adult-determined patterns; 5. we must relate our services and programs to those of other organizations and groups in the community and help relate our young adult members to them; 6. we must look beyond the walls of our buildings and seek to serve young people in their own setting as well as in the agency setting; 7. we must work with and not for young people in interpreting to the community the wider needs of youth not only for recreational opportunities but for other basic elements essential to full living."

Joseph Cadden, executive secretary of the American Youth Congress, New York City, said: "Young people themselves are carrying on group work today because they recognize the value of group education and group action. They see most clearly that of all the virtues, organization is the greatest of all . . . Current problems of young adults can be approached intelligently only through self-organization along democratic lines, giving young people themselves an opportunity of understanding their problems and acting accordingly. Given that opportunity there is every reason to believe that their faith in the American form of government will continue and develop. Without the opportunity to practice democracy, young people will increasingly become susceptible to demagoguery."

Three viewpoints of "The Democratic Process in Agency Administration and Program" were presented by: Mrs. Austin L. Kimball, president, National Board, Y. W. C. A.'s, Buffalo; Leah T.

Dickinson, assistant to director, Hull House, Chicago, and Annetta M. Dieckmann, industrial secretary, Y. W. C. A., Chicago.

Democracy, Mrs. Kimball said, cannot be shaken by the ideologies of Europe and Asia; it is endangered from within by those of us who distrust, deny and betray it. "Democracy does not just happen," she declared. "It must be worked at if it is to live, and unless we work at it in the small arenas of our lives, we cannot hope to ever see it really function in the larger arenas of state, nation and world. It becomes apparent that some agency in the community has an important role to play in keeping democracy alive. The group work agency by its very nature is equipped to make this contribution as is no other agency in the community set-up."

That settlements should join the forces of organized labor in trying to get democracy in the working and political lives of men and women, was Miss Dickinson's opinion. She told how a chapter of the Social Service Employees' Union recently was formed at Hull House. Discussing the basic question of the function of a settlement today, Miss Dickinson quoted a statement made by the Hull House Union: "We believe that settlements should join the forces of organized labor in trying to get democracy in the working and political lives of men and women. It has always been a function of the settlements to teach workers their rights, and these now include the legal right to organize into unions. As members of a unionized and democratically run settlement we are in a stronger position to teach the unorganized and unaware of our neighborhood the value of democracy than we could be otherwise."

Miss Dieckmann stated: "In the give and take of a club, where each member speaks as well as listens, at worst accepts the decision of the majority and at best truly integrates his ideas with the ideas of others, devotion to democratic ideals is bred."

**A** MERICANS' sense of humor will help them to preserve democracy, declared Eduard C. Lindeman, professor, New York School of Social Work, in a discussion of the opportunity of group work for education in democracy. Describing as "dangerous" the lag between this country's economic democracy and its political democracy, he said: "Democracy, as a satisfying mode of life, rests upon the assumption that we shall be moving steadily in the direction of more widely distributed ownership of property, a tendency toward general equality of income, and a gradual trend toward participation in education and the various arts."

Dan L. Adler, research assistant in the Child Welfare Research Station, State University of Iowa,

Iowa City, reported on a three-year experiment conducted by psychological observers at the University to test the effect of democratic, authoritarian and laissez-faire rule on groups of boys. He said the boys showed the greatest amount of "real friendliness and a medium amount of healthy horseplay and aggressive behavior" under the democratic tests. In the authoritarian tests the boys either grew irritable or apathetic, while those groups subjected to a laissez-faire atmosphere grew listlessly bored, he declared. The tests were conducted with clubs of 11-year-old boys.

Clinton S. Golden, director of the Northeastern Region of the Steel Workers Organizing Committee, Pittsburgh, told how democracy is being brought to American industry and how the SWOC is training its local officers for democratic leadership. Rapid organization of the steel industry threw a heavy responsibility on local officers of the SWOC before they had time to train themselves, Mr. Golden said, and to meet this need, the union has instituted a wide educational program, one feature of which is a summer training camp at Mt. Davis, Pa.

Two speakers discussed "The Relation of the Group Worker to the Indigenous Leader—"Janie Adamczyk of the Department of Sociology, Northwestern University, and Nathan E. Cohen, executive director, Springfield, Mass., Jewish Community Center.

Training for leadership, said Miss Adamczyk, should begin in childhood. She reported this is being done in many Chicago social agencies and that young people so trained are giving constructive service to the groups to which they belong. The trained leader, as distinguished from the "natural" leader, she said, knows how to give each individual a sense of personal satisfaction while at the same time he trains them in group living and directs their interest to socially desirable ends.

Said Mr. Cohen: "Groups desire self-determination, as manifested by their preference for indigenous leadership, both in the limited and broader sense of the term. Since this drive for self-determination on the part of the group is one of the objectives of group work, the professional group worker not only respects this desire but also encourages it by working through and with indigenous leadership rather than assuming active leadership himself. In this group worker-leader relationship, the indigenous leader must be regarded from the standpoint of an individual as well as a leader of a group for both the group and himself to benefit most from the situation."

"In spite of the fact that record keeping in group work is a subject which appears on practically every program of every organization concerned with the practice of group work, there is little common understanding of group recording in the

field," Gertrude Wilson, associate professor of Group Work, School of Applied Social Sciences, University of Pittsburgh, declared at a session considering the use of records in the practice of group work. "The professional group worker's function," Miss Wilson said, "is that of supervision rather than group leadership . . . There are comparatively few professional group workers . . . Throughout this generation at least, the majority of these workers will be absorbed into administrative rather than actual group leadership positions. This being the case, teaching supervision of untrained leaders becomes of paramount importance . . . We must assure those in our membership that the group experience we offer is one which helps meet their personal and social needs. This we can do through adequate teaching supervision of the available leadership. The objective test of the degree of our success lies in the narrative records of the group leaders."

Ida Oppenheimer, executive secretary, Jewish Vacation Association, New York City, related experiences of her organization since it was founded in 1926 as a clearing bureau to simplify the placement of children in camp by centralizing information. "In attempting to coordinate work at camp, both with pre-camp procedures and post-camp follow-up," she said, "an experiment in counsellor training has been carried on for several years. This involves meeting with the counsellors first in town, then at camp at regular intervals throughout the summer, to discuss the types of problems which might arise out of the backgrounds of the children as well as specific situations which are presenting difficulties."

Speaking on "Job Preparation and Guidance on a National Front," Mary H. S. Hayes, director of Guidance and Placement, National Youth Administration, Washington, D. C., said that with 5,000,000 or more youth in the nation unemployed, the NYA is providing work projects for little more than 235,000. She declared: "The final step in any vocational guidance program is the giving of assistance to the young person in obtaining a regular job. To this end, the NYA has been responsible for the establishment of junior employment divisions of State Employment Services in 127 cities of 39 states. To these offices have come nearly half a million young people between the ages of 16 and 25, with the majority falling between the ages of 18 and 21." Of this number, she said, jobs in private industry have been secured for 190,641.

ORGANIZED under the chairmanship of Wayne McMillen, professor of Social Work, University of Chicago, the Community Organization Section program opened with a discussion of the problems of social welfare planning within the Federal Government.



Dr. Martha M. Eliot, assistant chief of the U. S. Children's Bureau, surveyed the work of the Interdepartmental Committee to Coordinate Health and Welfare Activities, which was established in 1935, and of the Technical Committee on Medical Care, one of fourteen technical committees created under the parent committee. From the studies of the technical committee, Dr. Eliot said, "two facts have become increasingly clear: First, that existing services for the conservation of national health are inadequate to secure to the citizens of the United States such health of body and mind as they should have; second, that nothing less than a national, comprehensive health program can lay the basis for action adequate to the nation's needs."

A session on the relationship between social planning and money-granting functions introduced a discussion by Edward D. Lynde, executive secretary of the Welfare Federation of Cleveland on the role of the council in reviewing budgets and allocating funds. The basic idea of centralized social planning for a community, whether it be large or small, is to avoid planning determined by the whims and caprices of individuals and to substitute planning based on social facts and sound, all-round thinking, Mr. Lynde said. There is no set plan of community organization which should be applied to every community," he declared, "but the allocation of budgets needs to be knit into the job of community planning and closely tied up with the council of social agencies, whether or not such a council is separate from the community chest or central fund-raising effort."

Speaking on "The Neighborhood Approach in Community Organization," Leroy A. Ramsdell, director, Hartford Community Chest, said that approach is like a public right of way, and is open to any individual or any organization that sees in it a more hopeful, more interesting, or otherwise more attractive way of reaching the contemplated objectives. He outlined four basic principles to any utilization of the neighborhood approach as follows: 1. Each enterprise must be conceived in terms of the circumstances constituting the particular neighborhood situation; 2. the structure and program of the enterprise must be developed by methods which utilize the natural tendencies implicit in the situation; 3. the program must be adequately and appropriately serviced professionally; 4. the enterprise must have a physical focus appropriately located within the neighborhood.

How farmers can organize successfully was discussed by Courtenay Dinwiddie, general secretary National Child Labor Committee, New York City. He detailed four requirements for successful organization as follows: 1. New organizations must be built around an initial interest of the group that is being organized; 2. quick growth may be had for the purpose of attacking some evil, but permanent vitality depends upon some continuing and worth-

while program of education; 3. one of the greatest elements of strength is to be found where the organization program calls for and uses the services of an expert concerned with promoting the interest of the group he is serving; 4. one of the most important elements of strength is the actual participation of the individuals in the group in the work of organization, in responsibility for the conduct of its affairs and in both planning and action in relation to its program."

Financial control of privately supported social welfare should never dominate the methods and standards of social work if advances are to be made in community planning for social service, Edward L. Ryerson, Jr., of Chicago emphasized in a discussion of joint financing of private social work. Speaking of money-raising for the support of social services, he said: "Our Community Fund plan in Chicago is based on the principle that the agencies must preserve their full identity and responsibility and to this end must help to meet their own needs."

M. L. Wilson, under-secretary of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., in an address on "Identifying and Developing Leadership at the County Level," declared he has found a new hope for threatened American democracy growing in the soil that bred it—the seedbed soil of the local community.

"When word comes to me from time to time," he said, "about groups that are taking counsel together on a real community basis, providing for exchange of ideas, I am strongly tempted to throw caution to the winds and turn prophet and say that here are the places where will be bred and raised future leaders to follow in the line of succession to the men who gave this country its original unity and successfully rebuilt that unity each time it was threatened by the crisis of economic disaster and war." Mr. Wilson cited the success of the Dallas County Forum in Dallas County, Ia., and the Citizens Fact Finding Movement of Georgia as two conspicuous examples of how practicing democracies can work—on a county level in Iowa and a state-wide basis in Georgia.

Speaking on "Gearing Research into Community Planning and Community Action," Mary Stanton, executive secretary, Council of Social Agencies, Los Angeles, said: "Were we to go into the laboratory where specifications for new machines are developing, we would find that community organization work is in real need of the same analysis and development as social case work and social group work are experiencing . . . Since social work is unlike business, orders cannot be issued for the results of research to be carried out in recommended plans. We are only successful as the agencies and public ride with us from the beginning of the trip to the end of it. Agencies are seeing beyond their immediate specialties. They



are becoming interpretation conscious. Some are research conscious. Others need a crier or guide to explain what lies to the right and to the left along the way. Knowledge and participation of agency boards and staffs in the research, planning and action processes will lead to synchronized gearing."

In a talk on "Informational Controls for Community Programs," Stuart A. Rice, chairman, United States Central Statistical Board, Washington, D. C., stressed three important points: 1. The need for local agencies of data-coordination for community purposes; 2. the availability of large stores of un-utilized Federal information pertaining to local communities; 3. the importance of standardized statistical areas within the local community. "I can see no reason why the larger American cities should not create, officially or unofficially, an agency in each to coordinate, and possibly in part to collect and collate, information which is needed for their own community programs, in a manner roughly similar to that of the Central Statistical Board," Mr. Rice commented.

MARY ANDERSON, director, Women's Bureau, U. S. Department of Labor, served as the chairman of the Social Action Section, which opened its program with a meeting on "Civil Liberty, Its Functions in a Democracy." Speakers included Mary N. Winslow, executive board member, National Women's Trade Union League, Washington, D. C., and Robert Morss Lovett, recently appointed government secretary to the Virgin Islands.

Speaking on "The Danger to Democracy of Legislation against Minority Groups," Miss Winslow strongly attacked two particular types of restrictive legislation now spreading in the United States—against the employment of married women and against the alien.

"During the past year," she said, "in many state Legislatures laws have been proposed prohibiting married women from keeping their jobs in government service, prohibiting married women from securing such jobs, or requiring that single women who have such jobs shall immediately resign if they marry. In other states, similar laws have been proposed prohibiting such employment for married persons . . . Now this is a very discouraging and a very serious situation from the standpoint of those who would preserve the fundamental precepts of Democracy, which are the right of any citizen to work—to earn—and to share in the constructive tasks of Democracy.

"Although married women have formed an easy target for discrimination in the present intense competition for employment," she continued, "there is another group in the United States who are equally vulnerable and far more susceptible

to discriminations based on prejudice and what sound like the highest and most patriotic reasons: the aliens in this country against whom recently there has been a rising tide of viciously discriminatory legislation introduced in Congress . . . What kind of a Democracy is it whose citizens can contemplate or tolerate a suggestion that we establish 'internment' (concentration) camps for aliens, criminals, anarchists and similar classes 'whose native countries won't issue passports for them' as is suggested in the Hobbs Resolution H. R. 4768? What kind of freedom of speech can we stand for in a nation whose citizens suggest the deportation of any alien who believes in or advocates a change in the form of government, which is a provision in the Dempsey Bill H. R. 4860?" Miss Winslow pointed out that in reality much of the proposed "alien" legislation is anti-Semitic legislation in which the word "alien" is substituted for "Jew" and "in this way to secure the discrimination desired from apparently the highest motives of patriotism." She said the United States actually is confronted with no "alien problem" and cited figures showing that from July, 1932, to July, 1938, 241,962 immigrants were admitted to the United States for permanent residence and during the same period 246,449 aliens previously admitted for permanent residence moved away—4,487 more having left than arrived.

Speaking on "Freedom of Discussion in Democracy," Mr. Lovett said war and the revolutionary change toward a planned economy are two aspects of the present situation which threaten the very existence of the democratic state. Citing the ruling class as hostile to "that vital principle of Democracy, freedom of discussion," he noted the "appalling number of bills in the national and state Legislatures tending to curb this freedom in respect to economic measures. Freedom of speech and civil rights as represented by labor, he declared, are confronted by three hostile forces—the police, the courts and private armies of gangsters supplied by strike-breaking agencies.

"There are," said Mr. Lovett, "two aspects of the situation with respect to the freedom of speech which demand special consideration today, because they threaten the very existence of the democratic state. They are war and revolution . . . When I speak of 'revolution' I mean that inevitable change toward a planned economy by virtue of which the machinery of the distribution of goods will be so improved that the productive resources of the country, including man power, may be fully employed, without incurring what is called overproduction. Since our present system of private capitalism allows the employment of such resources only in so far as is consistent with profit, such a change involves either the outright assumption of ownership of the chief instruments of production by the state or the control by government

of those who at present make the major economic decisions in the interest of private gain."

A session on "Government and the New Business Cycle" introduced two speakers—William Hodson, commissioner of Welfare, New York City, and William H. Stead, acting director of the Employment Service of the U. S. Department of Labor.

Unemployment relief and home relief will continue, said Mr. Hodson, and America had better face the problem now because men "may forget the blessing of liberty in the face of prolonged insecurity." He asserted that "decent work and decent wages for all the employed people" is the real hope of the country. America, however, must use other and more immediate remedies. Even in good times, he declared, there will be a permanent relief load and the Federal government must share the cost of home relief. He cited four measures which may effect reduction of the permanent relief load, as follows: 1. Extension of unemployment insurance to cover the mass of workers, especially those in the lower paid categories; 2. broadening and deepening old-age insurance; 3. health insurance to cover workers unemployed through illness; 4. payment of decent living wages to the 21,000,000 families including 80,000,000 Americans who cannot subsist on incomes "which are inadequate to provide a standard of living which America wants for its people."

Dealing with unemployment planning, Mr. Stead said: "To stabilize our economy and to allow for healthy, orderly growth, we have got to plan . . . We run a far greater risk of saddling ourselves with some sort of unwelcome autocracy if we neglect the function of planning in a democratic society than if we apply it." He summarized three basic problems of unemployment planning, as follows: 1. As a nation we must decide what part of our population we want to use in our working force; 2. the labor market must be organized so that at any given level of production we may make the most effective use of the employed portion of the population; 3. national employment planning should insure a scale of production adequate to provide our entire population with a decent, comfortable—even a luxurious—living, according to our boasted American standards.

Discussing the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, Louise Stitt, director, Division of Minimum Wage, Women's Bureau, U. S. Department of Labor, condemned exploitation of men, women and little children in industrial home work for long hours and low wages. "Among the most 'unfair' labor standards to be found in American industry today," she said, "are those that prevail among workers who carry on industrial processes in their homes. Men and women and often little children work for long hours at home carding pins and buttons, knitting sweaters . . . for wages so low that they

amount to little more than supplements to relief allowances . . . The Fair Labor Standards Act makes no specific reference to industrial home work. But the policy of the Administrator has been to interpret the Act broadly, believing that the intention of Congress was to provide protection for as many workers as possible. Therefore, he has ruled that 'employees otherwise within the terms of the Act are entitled to its benefits whether they perform their work in factory, at home or elsewhere.'"

Frieda S. Miller, industrial commissioner of New York State, said minimum wage legislation wherever applied has always boosted the level of wages. "Experience has also shown," she stated, "that the minimum does not become the maximum . . . Minimum wage standards improve not only the condition of the workers. A rise in the level of wages is bound to be reflected in increasing purchasing power which is to the general public benefit."

Gordon R. Clapp, director of Personnel, Tennessee Valley Authority, Knoxville, discussing TVA labor policies and others that make for better living standards, said the TVA program is an excellent sample of democracy in action on a broad front. He cited the handling of the difficult problem of Federal-state relationships in the project as examples of the democratic method and said policies adopted to guide the internal administration of its work are based on the same faith in democratic method.

The National Labor Relations Board "already has promoted industrial peace and will do so even more in the future," Louis L. Jaffe, professor of Law, University of Buffalo, declared in a talk on the NLRB as a factor in industrial peace. Between 1937 and 1938, he said, strikes in industries in which the Board took jurisdiction decreased 48 percent from 3,184 to 1,673. However, in industries not subject to the Board, strikes decreased by only 29 percent, he stated. Speaking of current proposals to amend the Labor Relations Act, he said: "Some of them may be valuable, but the majority are designed either to make enforcement of the fundamental rights less effective or to secure temporary, and, I think, very delusive self-destructive advantages in the current civil war within labor ranks."

A session on "The New Promise of Fuller Health Protection for Workers" closed the program of the Social Action Section. John B. Andrews, New York City, director of the American Association for Labor Legislation, presided, and recalled that just twenty years ago the New York State Senate adopted a compulsory health insurance bill, and numerous official study commissions recommended this legislation. "The promising country-wide movement for health insurance two decades ago," he said, "was defeated by the same medically orga-



nized opposition which is operating today—and with the same arguments. “They claimed then as today that adequate medical care is available to everyone, that the British health insurance system is a failure, that through voluntary medical organization the social problems of sickness disability will be solved.” The opposition was wrong twenty years ago, and still is wrong, he declared.

Discussing voluntary health insurance plans proposed or under way under the auspices of medical societies, Dr. R. G. Leland, director of the Bureau of Medical Economics, American Medical Association, Chicago, said payment of cash indemnity benefits of health insurance ought to be made directly to patients. “Cash indemnity plans, he stated, “can be arranged to provide benefits for both prevention and medical care of those conditions which often far exceed the individual or family resources. A cash indemnity plan could be made to cover even medical care of the indigent. If payments were made directly to the patients, the procedure would only follow the example of other types of relief.” He commented that “no single formula will suffice to warrant a promise of fuller health protection. Truth, honesty, unselfishness, coordination of energies and the preservation of proven values must be woven into the fabric of any proposal for new methods of medical care.”

**T**HE Public Welfare Administration Section program was organized under the direction of Charles F. Ernst, director, Washington State Department of Social Security, and William J. Ellis, commissioner, New Jersey State Department of Institutions and Agencies, co-chairmen.

In an address on “Integration of Unemployment Insurance, Unemployment Relief and Works Programs,” William Hodson of New York City declared that people on relief are honorable people who unfortunately don’t have jobs and can’t work for their daily bread. In a vigorous defense of the 164,000 families under care in New York City, Mr. Hodson hit out squarely at the “current tendency to speak of home relief as something which is degrading. The Department of Welfare, he said, “is proud” of its service to “our fellow citizens who can’t get jobs . . . It is a disgraceful thing to imply that there is something wrong with the individual who is placed in this position through no fault of his own.” Mr. Hodson urged several social improvements including: the closest kind of general planning and administrative coordination between all forms of work and home relief, public assistance and social insurances; liberalization of the unemployment insurance law to reach millions of workers not now covered; integration of the home relief program as part of the general

social security program with Federal grants-in-aid.

C. P. R. Cochrane, Jr., assistant director, Bureau of Unemployment Compensation, Social Security Board, Washington, D. C., said: “Unemployment compensation, in my opinion, can be so improved that the problem of coordination with other assistance programs will be restricted to the point in the benefit process when the worker exhausts his benefit rights.”

Speaking on the subject of administration of medical care in the proposed national health program, Lee C. Dowling, deputy commissioner, New York State Department of Social Welfare, advocated a “realistic” approach to the development of a national health program and urged that such a program extend its benefits to all in need of medical assistance—whether or not they are in receipt of relief.

Dr. Franz Goldman, fellow, Yale School of Medicine, spoke on recent developments in tax-supported medical care in Great Britain. Being destitute is no longer the sole basis for eligibility for medical care at public expense in Great Britain. The steady growth of government responsibility for organizing and providing medical care and the slow but final abandonment of the qualifications of “destitution” as the only basis for tax-supported medical care, are the two main achievements of reform in this field in Great Britain in the last decade, he asserted.

“We must accept the principle that like or similarly related governmental functions ought to be grouped together under a single administrative authority,” William H. Stauffer, commissioner of the Virginia State Department of Public Welfare, declared in a discussion of the coordination of Federal programs in rural areas. “This should be done both for the convenience of the public which is to be served as well as for the economies which integration promises.”

Speaking on the same subject, John L. Montgomery, director of the Monmouth County Welfare Board, Red Bank, N. J., said one of the major problems encountered by coordinators of the Federal, state and community programs is that of maintaining mutual satisfaction among the contracting parties. This problem, he stated, is “one of constant readjustment, interpretation, the balancing of rights and claims, of hopes and desires.”

A paper prepared by Dr. Ellen C. Potter, director of Medicine, New Jersey State Department of Institutions and Agencies, and read in her absence by Irving Engelman, assistant director of Old Age Assistance of the same department, pointed out the relation of older welfare agencies to new agencies created by recent legislation. To be effective in this country, Dr. Potter said, public



welfare administration must combine Federal, state and local participation, financial and administrative, with supervision by the higher governmental unit of the lower, based on known standards.

In a talk on the relation of the juvenile court to programs for children under social security legislation, Joseph E. Alloway, director of the New Jersey State Board of Children's Guardians, cited the juvenile court as the needed partner for children's agencies administering such legislation. "Probably no social question is of such vital significance, nor provocative of such hope and despair, as that of juvenile delinquency," he said. "Amidst this seething activity there stands as a focal point of thought the juvenile court, where meet all the diverse elements of the complicated problem."

Speaking on the relation of the field of education to the public welfare program, Niles Carpenter, dean of the University of Buffalo School of Social Work, named five necessary features of social work educational policy, as follows: "1. Such skills and techniques as are germane should certainly be taught. These include, of course, all that we know concerning the principles of public administration as applied to public social work; 2. there must be a comprehensive and penetrating understanding of the origins and growth of American institutions in general and of American public welfare and social work, in particular; 3. no program, no matter how imposing and elaborate; no policy, no matter how temporary and improvised, should be presented as a separate entity; 4. the concept of field work in education for public welfare must be expanded; 5. training in public welfare is not a matter of one or two post-graduate years, but of as many years as the public welfare worker, or aspirant worker, is intellectually alert."

A session on "Influence of Methods of Finance upon the Coordination of Welfare Programs" closed the section's program. Denzel C. Cline, associate professor of Economics, Michigan State College, pointed out that: "A coordinated plan is one that achieves the maximum social benefit at minimum social cost." He added: "In striving for a coordinated program, the first task is to determine the most appropriate governmental unit to administer each welfare service. After a satisfactory reallocation of welfare functions, the financial plan can be devised accordingly. It probably will be necessary to transfer Federal funds to the states and state funds to certain types of local governmental units. The conditional grant seems to be the most satisfactory device to achieve the maximum degree of welfare coordination."

**T**WELVE special committees, covering a wide range of subjects, held their series of meetings.

A feature of the Committee on Care of the Aged, arranged under the chairmanship of Ollie A. Randall, Community Service Society, New York City, was a session on "Designs for Living for Elderly People."

William H. Matthews, director of the Department of Special Services, Community Service Society, New York City, declared that apartment houses, designed and equipped to provide shelter for the destitute aged group in all communities, should be considered as part of the program of the various Federal housing authorities throughout the country. He strongly urged separate housing projects for the aged, and not space set aside for this group in projects designed for families taken from sub-standard living quarters.

Nelson B. Neff, supervisor, Division of Old Age Assistance, Washington State Department of Social Security, in a paper read in his absence by Mrs. Gwen Hardin, supervisor, Division for Blind, of the same Department, described a cooperative housing venture in Washington for single, elderly men and women without home ties. He said the problem of providing decent living accommodations for unattached persons, 60 or over, subsisting on a maximum grant of \$30 a month is being met in his state by the establishment of an increasing number of supervised homes where the boarders pool their slim resources to maintain themselves in comparative comfort.

Nancy L. Austin of the Division of Old Age Assistance, Illinois Department of Public Welfare strongly scored the use of "semi-institutional homes which shelter any number of people and are managed solely for profit." She urged the adoption of state laws governing supervision of all such homes, allowing sufficient flexibility for varying standards to meet the need of different sized groups. "The objective of a well planned state program for supervision of boarding homes for the aged," she said, "should not be to abolish homes but to raise the standards and to increase the number of good homes."

Samuel Gerson, executive director, Jewish Federation of St. Louis said: "As in other fields of social work, the pendulum defining the arc of service to the aged has swung far . . . Years ago, one thought only in terms of institutional care. More recently, the emphasis has been on family care and its benefits. And now we come to the mid-point between the two extremes, a service centered in the needs of the individual aged person and following his need with equal eagerness, whether it is in the direction of institutional or foster home care."

Organized under the chairmanship of Dr. William A. Bryan, superintendent, Worcester, Mass., State Hospital, the Committee on Care of the Mentally Ill opened its deliberations with a session on

the responsibility of the mental hospital to the community.

Barbara Estes, head social worker, Worcester State Hospital, said successful student training in mental hospitals rests on two fundamental premises. First, the hospital must be interested in the students primarily from the point of view of training them; second, the hospital staff must be ready to cooperate and accept their part of the teaching program. The training program for students is divided into four sections; psychiatry, social service techniques, community resources and personal adjustments of individual problems.

Dr. A. A. Low, assistant director, Psychiatric Institute, University of Illinois, told of the attack on present commitment laws being waged by thirty former mental patients in Chicago who are now recovered and banded together in an organization fighting the popular prejudice, "once insane; always insane." Legislation is being prepared for presentation at the next session of the Illinois Legislature which would provide that a patient would be sent by the certifying physicians directly to the hospital with the proviso that the superintendent notify the welfare commission within ten days of the patient's admission to the hospital.

Ethel B. Bellsmith, chief social worker, Central Islip State Hospital, Central Islip, N. Y., told how the parole of mental patients, not entirely recovered, to supervised occupations in other medical institutions, has proved a successful method of socially and happily adjusting them to the outside world at Central Islip Hospital. The plan has been followed for 15 years, she said.

A panel discussion on "Preparation for Public Welfare Work" was conducted by the Committee on Education for Social Work. Robert T. Lansdale, member of the faculty of the New York School of Social Work, acted as chairman. Participants included: Lewis Meriam, chairman, Institute for Government Research, the Brookings Institution, Washington, D. C.; Mary Raymond, director, New Orleans Department of Public Welfare; Grace A. Browning, assistant professor, School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago; E. M. Sunley, professor of Public Welfare, West Virginia University, and Karl de Schweinitz, director, Pennsylvania School of Social Work. Walter W. Pettit, director, New York School of Social Work, served as chairman of the committee.

Mr. Meriam: "Schools can furnish the student the opportunity to gain knowledge quickly, to learn the processes of gaining it and the sources from which it is to be secured . . . The importance of skills as distinct from knowledge is the thing that impresses me with respect to investigators,

case workers, personnel officers and administrators in the public welfare field. I am keen about case work in the schools because it gives the student first opportunity to demonstrate whether he has aptitude for that kind of human contact and, if he has, opportunity to develop it in actual situations under a degree of supervision, instruction and leadership that is impracticable in a public service unless it has a special training division."

Miss Raymond: "While case work practice in a public agency must relate itself to the setting in which it operates, professional training for that practice is essential . . . Professional training for public welfare work is basically the same as professional training for case work service in any field . . . Case work service in public agencies necessarily centers about the determination of eligibility . . . Training in professional schools should emphasize more than practice seems to indicate, the case work implications in the process of eligibility determination."

Miss Browning: "It seems to me that the differential in preparation for public welfare does not come in the basic training program so much as it does in the emphasis to be placed on certain subject matter and skills by the advanced student who either because his experience has preceded training or because of the demands for professional personnel is apt to enter or reenter the service at a point where he will carry heavy responsibility."

Mr. Sunley: Discussed the merit of a required sequence for pre-professional courses versus a suggested group of courses; problems confronting educational institutions in regard to informing, directing and encouraging the undergraduate students to consider entrance into the pre-professional social work courses; the use of pre-professional courses by agency staff members; the need for offering a rich, broad and intensive undergraduate preparation by the professional schools in those states where personnel standards are relatively low.

Mr. de Schweinitz: Posed such questions as: "Are we going to recognize social work as a general field for which we train people, having provision in the curriculum for social work in government, or are we going to develop separate departments? What relation are schools of social work to have to schools of public administration? Are training for social case work and for administration compatible?"

Michael M. Davis, chairman of the Committee on Research in Medical Economics, New York City, served as chairman of the Committee on Medical Care and participated in its first session, on "Rural Health Problems." Mr. Davis reported on a nationwide survey made by himself and Josephine Strode of the Department of Rural Social



Organization, Cornell University. Their survey disclosed that the policy followed in treating the poor in most rural districts is—no medical care except in extreme emergencies. Many of the rural doctors and welfare workers who cooperated with Mr. Davis and Miss Strode in making the survey of health needs in their communities advocated establishment of health services on a county unit basis.

**T**HE prime need of every community is a comprehensive program for the care of victims of chronic diseases—which are responsible for one-half of all deaths—Dr. Ernest P. Boas, chairman of the Committee of Chronic Illness, Welfare Council, New York City, said. He discussed "The Care of the Chronic Sick." He declared that although pestilences have been brought under control, "the great volume of chronic diseases form a plague of as great proportions as any to which mankind has been subject." Care of the chronic sick is primarily a responsibility of the local government, Dr. Boas said, with the help of the state if it is necessary. The solution of the problem cannot await the accident of private philanthropy, he stated.

Discussing "The Conversion of Almshouses into Institutions for the Chronically Ill," William E. Cole, head of the Department of Sociology, University of Tennessee, said the almshouse as it has been operated has been found wanting in almost every respect, even in economy, and if continued at all its character must be definitely changed. The almshouse population of the future, he asserted, will be made up largely of chronically ill individuals, and almshouses will have to be converted into hospitals. "Such converted homes of hospital type will find a logical gap in the social security program," he declared, "and will provide for those who spend their days on earth in sickness and pain all that society can provide—comfort, decent care, adequate food, clothing and shelter and opportunity for physical, mental and spiritual rehabilitation of any whom it may be possible to return to society."

A discussion of prevention-of-blindness techniques as variously applied through differing welfare media opened the program of the Committee on Prevention and Social Treatment of Blindness. William E. Bartram, executive secretary, Ohio Commission for the Blind, served as chairman of the committee.

Mr. Bartram said: "Too few public health or welfare organizations recognize the importance to a community of uniformly accessible eye service. In spite of the stimulating results of Federal, state and local cooperation in health and welfare, there are large areas within our national boundaries

without adequate eye service. And in sections where eye service is available there are unnumbered individuals who, while able to eke out a bare existence, have remained beyond the ken of the public assistance agencies, and, needing eye service, have found the private oculist beyond their financial reach and the public oculist restricted by bureaucratic regulations or procedures which force them to reduce themselves to the level of public dependency before he can serve them."

Speaking on the subject as seen by a private agency, John Williams Avirett, 2nd, president of the Maryland Society for the Prevention of Blindness, told of the scope and work of his organization. "My experience with the Maryland Society," he commented, "convinces me that a private agency engaged in prevention of blindness can function most successfully in educational, promotional and legislative activities. The first and fundamental step in any prevention-of-blindness program is that of spreading the word that almost two-thirds of all blindness can be prevented."

Mrs. Gwen Hardin, supervisor of the Division for the Blind, Washington State Department of Social Security, said that education of parents against the evil of blindness by approaching them through their children will be tried in the State of Washington during the next two years. "A speakers' bureau made up largely of eye physicians who will talk to the children about conditions in mature life and urge them to be conscious of the need of their parents' protecting their eye sight is perhaps a unique way to approach this," she asserted. "For years we have all talked to parents about the care of their children. Why not talk to children about the eye care of their parents?" She said the approach will be made through Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts and other organized groups of children.

Harry O. Page, commissioner, New Hampshire State Department of Public Welfare, reviewed his state's program for preventing blindness. Through the education department, annual medical inspection of sight and hearing is available to every child in the public schools, he said. It establishes lighting standards for all schools and supervises the purchase of suitable books, paper and other school equipment. Visually handicapped persons between the ages of 16 and 45 can receive vocational rehabilitation through the department of education, and partly sighted children are placed in special, sight-saving classes.

A Socratic dialogue on the social treatment of blindness was introduced with messages of greeting from Gov. Herbert H. Lehman of New York and Helen Keller, world famous author who overcame the twin handicap of deafness and blindness. Col. E. A. Baker, managing director of the Canadian National Institute for the Blind, Toronto,



summarized "present day concepts of the social treatment of blindness" as follows: 1. Sightless children of pre-school age should not be segregated and institutionalized; 2. the juvenile and youthful blind should be given adequate education by the community or state and up to the standards available to sighted children plus special training; 3. the sightless should be encouraged to take advantage of college and university training; 4. training and employment of sightless adults in individual occupations rather than in sheltered workshops; 5. coordination of service programs for the blind; 6. service programs for the adult blind in a good general service program of the community.

In a discussion on the development of an eye health program as seen by a medical social worker, Muriel Gayford of the Washington University Clinic, St. Louis, presented four objectives that must be accepted as basic to any program which is to emphasize the total social welfare program. They are: 1. Planning for a program which is based on a realistic knowledge of the situation; 2. constantly re-examining the attitudes toward problems of sight-conservation and blindness; 3. providing for flexibility in the functioning of the program, realizing the program is dealing with human beings who do not respond to regimentation; 4. learning to help the blind people to use all other types of available community resources as they are needed so there is a well integrated plan for their physical and social growth.

Speaking on social treatment of blindness from the viewpoint of public assistance agencies, Mrs. Gwen Hardin said: "Blind people are still individuals and if we are ever to succeed in social treatment programs with blind people, it must be done on an individual basis but with full community interest and understanding . . . The fact that a person loses his eyesight does not mean necessarily that he changes his personality, temperament and ability. It does mean that it is necessary for him, in many instances, to have the opportunity for retraining so he will realize fully the ability which he has to carry on."

Margaret Barnard, area director, New York State Department of Social Welfare, said blindness is only one of the handicaps that beset dependent families and should not result in segregation of either the afflicted persons or the families.

Gabriel Farrell, D.D., director of Perkins Institution for the Blind, Watertown, Mass., cited blindness as largely an old age and poverty problem and said the Social Security Act has challenged the efficiency of segregation or centralization of all services in one office. Segregation, he declared, is the prevailing program in work for the blind today and nearly every state in the Union has a program of this type.

**T**HE program of the Committee on Problems in Interstate Migration, arranged under the chairmanship of Dr. Ellen C. Potter, opened with a discussion of "The Effects of Population Mobility upon Regional and National Development in the United States." Carl C. Taylor, head of the Division of Farm Population and Rural Life of the U. S. Department of Agriculture, said the depression stopped the migration from the farm to the city and set in motion a new western migration of laborers. The new western movement of migrant laborers is a new phenomenon in our national life and while some of the problems of this new movement are becoming apparent, all its implications have not been recognized, he asserted.

John N. Webb, chief of the Urban Surveys Section of the WPA Division of Research, declared the "irresponsible" and "constitutionally unstable" migrant of today is a direct successor of the "hardy pioneer" and the "statemaker" of half a century ago. Mr. Webb defended the migrant against charges made against him in recent years. It was not until the depression settled on the country, he said, that the migrant became an undesirable. Migrants were respectable people not so long ago and were eulogized by congressional orators as people of intelligence, enterprise and courage. "It never occurred to those who criticized," he said, "that there might be migrants who never asked for aid, who went about their business and the business of the community, at no cost and some profit to society."

Discussing "The Migration of Farm Labor," Mercer G. Evans, director, Personnel and Labor Relations Division, Farm Security Administration, declared that the migrant agricultural worker suffers from discrimination in relief, community hostility and loss of the voting franchise. Estimates of this class, he said, range from 350,000 to 1,100,000. "In his triple disadvantage status—poor, mobile and agricultural—he menaces the community even as his own well being is menaced," said Mr. Evans. "And we might as well regard all approaches to the problem of the migrant's health, his housing, the education of his children and his low and uncertain income, as subsidiary to the broader problem of making him a responsible, self-respecting member of organized society." Among other suggestions looking toward improvement of the situation, he recommended extension to agricultural workers of the social security laws, the wages and hours laws and the Labor Relations Act.

Willis M. Oosterhof, administrative assistant, Bureau of Homeless and Unattached Persons, Michigan State Emergency Welfare Relief Commission, outlined a new program of relief for migrants in Michigan, designed to correct the flaws of the old Federal system, which makes aid more certain for the settled person and discourages

chronic transiency. Fingerprinting of transients, he said, is among the innovations introduced by the Michigan system. Fingerprinting is the rule in five of seven urban relief shelters—and although it is possible for a client to refuse, few have objected, he said. He explained how his state set up a functional division of homeless persons, established administrative responsibility on a local basis and set up camps to handle migratory relief problems that went beyond the scope of any one locality. One camp handles relief for unemployed lumberjacks and the other specializes in alcoholics, physical convalescents and old age problems.

A talk on the effect of the Social Security Act on the treatment of unmarried parenthood, by Mary S. Labaree, field consultant in Child Welfare, U. S. Children's Bureau, opened the sessions of the Committee on Problems Related to Unmarried Parenthood. Maud Morlock of the U. S. Children's Bureau served as chairman of the committee. Slow progress is being made nationally in bringing the benefits of the Social Security Act to unmarried mothers and their children, Miss Labaree said. She noted that eligibility qualifications, lack of funds locally, racial custom and community attitudes have impeded the successful development of the program. "Heretofore," she declared, "private agencies have often had to bear the burden of services to girls from wide areas, although the agencies have often worked under strict limitations of budget and program. Now that a public welfare structure is becoming generally available, the workers in this field need the benefit of the experience and guidance of this more experienced group. Team work of public and private agencies in the nation's new venture in social security is necessary if a future evaluation of its effects on service to unmarried parents and their children is to show positive values."

Organized under the chairmanship of Josephine Strode of Cornell University, the Committee on Rural Social Work opened with a session in which rural social workers from north, south, east and west told "what it takes" to pioneer on social frontiers.

Craig Berke, director, Social Security Office, Fall River County, S. D., told of the difficulties and achievements of the social security program in his region. South Dakota, he reported, has been divided into seven districts, each with a field supervisor, and instruction and training are being offered in a state-wide program. An increase in the personnel of the state office has resulted in a speeding up of the service, he said.

Mrs. Helen McLennan, district supervisor for the Michigan Old Age Assistance Bureau, Coldwater, Mich., told how her state dispenses "new life" to its old age group in the rural sections by supplying needs that range from romance to soap.

She described the work of the county visitor in rural Michigan as "a science for knowing tears and laughter without weeping or becoming gay" and pictured the visitor as a "Jack of all trades" who "must play the part of lawyer, detective, realtor, farm appraiser, insurance agent, errand boy and clerical worker."

Beatrice S. Hagood, director of Escambia County Department of Public Welfare, Brewton, Ala., stated that compulsory education is the primary social need of the South today. Material relief alone will not solve the social problems of the South, she said. "It can only be a temporary palliative and does not make for lasting betterment," she asserted. "We must bring knowledge of how to live healthily and happily. We must bring education to our underprivileged folk. We must expand public health and welfare services. And better agricultural practices are needed to save and enrich the land."

Virginia Starkweather, welfare agent of White Pine County and a visitor for the Division of Old Age Assistance of the Nevada State Welfare Department, told of rudimentary efforts to bring social betterment to her county, where "gambling, drinking and everything is wide open." She pictured the plight of the distressed in her country where doctors charge \$1 a mile for day visits and \$1.50 a mile for night calls. Describing what the social security program is accomplishing in White Pine County, she said: "It is giving a small measure of security to 146 old people under the Old Age Assistance plan. A public health nursing service has been set up in the state with a nurse to each of the seven districts. The nurse in our district covers an area of 15,000 square miles. Impossible as her job might seem to be, a marked improvement in general health conditions has resulted. Nevada has not yet availed herself of the aid to dependent children part of the social security program."

Three speakers discussed "The Situational Approach to a Social Work Practice in a Rural Setting," Alice L. Taylor, associate professor of Social Work, Graduate School of Social Work, Nebraska State University; James A. Anderson, executive secretary, Tri-Cities Welfare League, Goose Creek, Tex., and Mrs. Juanita V. Perkins, supervisor, Rural Training Unit, Colorado State Department of Public Welfare.

Miss Taylor said that the rural worker, in addition to being well qualified as to personality, experience and training, should have graduate work in case work plus basic courses in legal, psychiatric and medical information; social statistics and research; child welfare; community organization and planning; dietetics and household management, public welfare administration and group work.

Mr. Anderson said: "In the rural community, the



social worker finds the sum total of community-felt problems expressed through individuals, organizations and unorganized groups. Any or all may tell him just what is needed to cure the community social ills . . . The social worker welcomes these suggestions because they enable him to better understand the thinking, philosophy and morals in that community and thus he is better able to understand and help the client work through his problems as a member of this very same community."

Mrs. Perkins pointed out that in the practice of social work in a rural setting, few things are "just between the client and the social worker." As with all other events in the lives of rural families, their contacts with the social worker are shared with the whole neighborhood, which gives or withholds its approval in accordance with what its framework of social and moral values supports as right, she said.

Addressing a session of the Committee on Social Aspects of Children's Institutions on "Readjusting the Child Back into the Community," John E. Dula, senior social worker, Bureau of Child Welfare, New York State Department of Social Welfare, set forth five principles which should underlie the programs of institutions for helping their children readjust to the community. They are: 1. Aftercare is part of the whole process and must begin when the child first receives institutional care; 2. institutions must now make themselves part of the community; 3. children become adults at a later age today and we should attempt to secure recognition of this fact by getting our laws redefined; 4. the institution must act upon its responsibility for aftercare; 5. a well-qualified staff is needed to meet this responsibility.

Mae Fleming of the Department of Public Welfare, Childrens Aid Branch, Toronto, observed that a child's life is like a bank account in that there is a direct relationship between what is put into it and what can be drawn out of it. She pointed out that staffs in children's institutions must understand the relationship between the child's past environment and his present behavior in order to know how to treat him and how to counteract the effect of his previous experiences.

Lou-Eva Longan, superintendent, St. Christopher's School, Dobbs Ferry, N. Y., served as chairman of the "institutions" committee.

**T**HE Committee on Social Aspects of Public Housing, organized under the chairmanship of Joseph P. Tufts, executive director, Pittsburgh Housing Association, opened with a session on "Catching up with Housing." Speakers included Stanley M. Isaacs, president of the Borough of Manhattan, New York City, and Jean Coman of the Management Division, United States Housing Authority, Washington, D. C.

Success of the New York State housing legislation at the recent legislative session in face of a wave of "false economy" was cited by Mr. Isaacs as proof of the "power of the social agencies to bring about social reform."

Low cost public housing will eventually be as much accepted as a part of government service as police and fire protection are today, Miss Coman forecast. Claiming that critics of public housing are generally those who are misinformed or who do not understand the program, Miss Coman urged that social workers strive for more and better public housing in their local communities.

John Ihlder, executive officer of The Alley Dwelling Authority for the District of Columbia, said public housing should reach all families whose incomes are too low to tempt private buildings. This, he stated, is the primary function of a public housing program. "Public housing should seek by every practicable means to reduce the net cost of housing," he declared. "Net cost may mean greater construction cost if this is compensated for by decreased repair and maintenance charges or by increased investment values."

A paper on rural housing prepared by John O. Walker, director, Resettlement Division, Farm Security Administration, and read in his absence by Wendell L. Lund, assistant director, stated that a large-scale program providing rural housing where a higher standard of living may be developed on a sound farm plan, would be "the greatest stabilizing influence one could create in this country."

A session on programs for social treatment of the adult offender opened the program of the Committee on Social Treatment of the Adult Offender. Edgar M. Gerlach, warden, Federal Detention Headquarters, New York City, served as chairman of the committee.

Nathaniel Cantor, professor of Criminology, University of Buffalo, declared that a major cause of crime is the American habit of rating people's importance by their economic status. Unable to attain wealth, some people develop feelings of frustration, fear or inadequacy, and, in an attempt to deny these feelings, develop criminal behavior, he said. Mental hygiene programs have helped some criminals overcome their personality defects, he reported, but along with efforts to treat individuals must go social action to remedy the community conditions that cause crime.

Ray L. Huff, general superintendent of Penal Institutions in the District of Columbia, in a discussion of "Parole Selection and Release," said the community's opinion of the prisoner as well as his own progress has to be taken into consideration in deciding whether he should be put on parole. Warning against "clemency" as a prime factor for putting a man on parole, Mr. Huff declared that parole should not be given to reward acts of heroism or good prison record, to pay for assistance to



the government in testimony, to relieve family distress, to give "another chance" or to relieve overcrowding of prisons. Instead, he said, parole authorities should consider tangible evidence that a change has taken place, not only in the prisoner's own attitude, but also in the community and in his family, friends, and others who are interested in him.

Two sessions were conducted by the Committee on Statistics and Accounting in Social Work, which was headed by C. Rufus Rorem, director, Committee on Hospital Service, American Hospital Association, Chicago, chairman.

Anne E. Geddes, chief, Division of Public Assistance Research, and Joel Gordon of the Bureau of Research and Statistics, of the Social Security Board, jointly prepared a paper on "The Concept

of Administrative Expenses in Accounting for Public Assistance Expenditures."

"To develop fundamental concepts in any field, it is often necessary first to destroy prevailing misconceptions," Miss Geddes and Mr. Gordon said. "In accounting for public assistance expenditures a concept of 'administrative expenses' which is of questionable validity has gained wide acceptance . . . The fallacies in the currently accepted concept of so-called 'administrative expenses' might be disregarded if they did not have undesirable consequences. Of these, the most serious is the increasingly common practice of limiting 'administrative expenses' by law to a specified percentage of assistance payments or total expenditures. Such limitations are seriously hampering the effective administration of public assistance programs in many states and localities."

## POSTSCRIPT: BUFFALO 1939

(Continued from Page 5)

Florida have thrown themselves into. Josephine Wilkins told us at Buffalo how yeast and insight have been brought together in Georgia through the team play of everyday organizations from churches and service clubs to farm and fraternal bodies.

The American Public Welfare Association, the National Consumers' League, the National Federation of Settlements, state conferences of social work, such as California's, and a score of more specialized organizations have built up impressive nuclei for opportune research and cooperative effort. But by and large, neither nationally, nor state by state, can we be said to have applied in this new epoch of expanding public activities the precedents set long ago by the Public Charities Association of Pennsylvania and the State Charities Aid Association of New York in following through as their primary function the work of government agencies—assessing, sustaining, blocking, pushing out for advances in law and administration.

This was brought home to us inescapably at Buffalo. While the Conference was in session Congressional action was hanging fire on public assistance and the social insurances, on the WPA and the white collar projects, on wages and hours and labor relations, on the National Health bill to round out the Social Security program.

Yet obviously, there is no general formation of lay and professional workers—on all fours with this Conference of ours—committed to an overall cognizance of these and similar measures, so that it may come to grips with what is weak and wasteful in performance or proposal, can seize on what is promising and strike out for long plans. In some of those fields there is no effective national salient whatever; and it is not understating it to say that in none of them is there an organization

with sufficient resources and membership to hold out against forces that would degrade or ditch such measures. Nonetheless the federal-state services at stake are of a sort espoused before our Conference for a third of a century. Enacted at length under spur of the depression, they are charged with nothing less than the reinforcement of the badly shaken footholds of livelihood and citizenship in our American democracy.

We know that in 1919 and after, wartime developments in the fields of education, recreation, labor standards and relations buckled and slipped back. That was part of a general relapse after a supreme national effort. Clearly there is danger of a similar setback all along the line now, after the exertions and innovations that have been unlimbered to combat the human consequences of the hard times.

In my address, I tried to turn the situation right-side-up—to put it in terms not only of grievous social injury but of opportunity; of where we as social workers can take hold. So long as we fail to implement ourselves, in common with socially-minded citizens everywhere, with agencies that can count at city hall and county seat, state and national capitals, so long shall we leave isolated public social workers out on the limb of the spoils system; so long shall we risk the scuttling of permanent plans for the conservation of life and well-being.

This then, is what I read between the lines of the papers and discussions at Buffalo—the object lesson of this great perennial gathering we call our National Conference of Social Work, which within its self-imposed limits as a discussion body has more than proved its mettle and which makes its recurring contribution as an educational force.

What we need are tools to match it in the field of social action. For, as Dr. Charles W. Eliot was wont to point out, education of human beings that does not issue in action, thwarts and wastes the intelligence that is educated.

## CONFERENCE ORGANIZATION

**E**LECTION results at the Buffalo meeting and the Conference organization for 1939-1940 are given herewith. The 1940 Conference is to be held in Grand Rapids, Michigan, May 26-June 1. The new 1939-1940 officers are:

### President

GRACE L. COYLE  
Cleveland, Ohio

### First Vice-President

ARLIEN JOHNSON  
Los Angeles, California

### Second Vice-President

SIDNEY HOLLANDER  
Baltimore Maryland

### Third Vice-President

MRS. DEFOREST VAN SLYCK  
New York City

### Treasurer

ARCH MANDEL  
New York City

### General Secretary

HOWARD R. KNIGHT  
Columbus, Ohio

### EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

**Ex-Officio:**—Grace L. Coyle, president; Arlien Johnson, first vice-president; Sidney Hollander, second vice-president; Mrs. DeForest Van Slyck, third vice-president; Arch Mandel, treasurer; Elwood Street, Membership Chairman.

**Term expiring 1940:**—Shelby M. Harrison, New York City; David H. Holbrook, New York City; Betsey Libbey, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Bertha McCall, New York City; Roy Sorenson, Chicago, Illinois; George S. Stevenson, New York City; Alfred F. Whitman, Boston, Massachusetts.

**Term expiring 1941:**—Karl de Schweinitz, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Charles F. Ernst, Olympia, Washington; Harry Greenstein, Baltimore, Maryland; Fred K. Hoehler, Chicago, Illinois; Cheney C. Jones, Boston, Massachusetts; Clara Paul Paige, Chicago, Illinois; Mary Stanton, Los Angeles, California.

**Term expiring 1942:**—Helen Cody Baker, Chicago, Illinois; Leah Feder, St. Louis, Missouri; Jane M. Hoey, Washington, D. C.; The Very Reverend Monsignor Robert F. Keegan, New York City; Robert T. Lansdale, New York City; Edward D. Lynde, Cleveland, Ohio; Ellen C. Potter, Trenton, New Jersey.

### PROGRAM COMMITTEE

#### Ex-Officio

Grace L. Coyle, Cleveland, Ohio, Chairman.  
Paul Kellogg, New York City.  
Howard R. Knight, Columbus, Ohio.

#### Term Expires 1940

Mary Irene Atkinson, Washington, D. C.  
Arlien Johnson, Los Angeles, California.

#### Term Expires 1941

Frederick J. Moran, Albany, New York.  
Joseph P. Tufts, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

#### Term Expires 1942

Ben M. Selekman, Boston, Massachusetts.  
Margaret Rich, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

### Section Chairmen

Section I—Social Case Work.

Elizabeth H. Dexter, Brooklyn, New York.

Section II—Social Group Work.

Roy Sorenson, Chicago, Illinois.

Section III—Community Organization.

Pierce Atwater, St. Paul, Minnesota.

Section IV—Social Action.

Wayne McMillen, Chicago, Illinois.

Section V—Public Welfare Administration.

Ellen C. Potter, Trenton, New Jersey.

### SECTION I—SOCIAL CASE WORK

Chairman: Elizabeth H. Dexter, Family Service Department, Brooklyn Bureau of Charities, Brooklyn, New York.

Vice-Chairman: Aleta Brownlee, U. S. Children's Bureau, San Francisco, California.

#### Term Expires 1940

Edith M. Baker, U. S. Children's Bureau, Washington, D. C.

Elizabeth G. Gardiner, National Society for the Prevention of Blindness, New York City.

Florence Hollis, School of Applied Social Sciences, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.

Margaret Steel Moss, Dauphin County Board of Assistance, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

#### Term Expires 1941

Catherine Bliss, Social Service Department, Children's Hospital, Los Angeles, California.

Susan Burlingham, Family Society of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Leah Feder, Department of Social Work, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri.

Gordon Hamilton, New York School of Social Work, New York City.

Ruth Smalley, Smith College School for Social Work, Northampton, Massachusetts.

#### Term Expires 1942

Herschel Alt, Children's Aid Society and St. Louis Provident Association, St. Louis, Missouri.

Lillian Johnson, Ryther Child Center, Seattle, Washington.

Rosemary R. Reynolds, County Relief Administration, Cleveland, Ohio.

Clare M. Tousley, Community Service Society of New York, New York City.

Grace White, School of Social Work, Tulane University, New Orleans, Louisiana.

### SECTION II—SOCIAL GROUP WORK

Chairman: Roy Sorenson, National Council, Y. M. C. A.'s, Chicago, Illinois.

Vice-Chairman: Dorothea F. Sullivan, Girl Scouts, New York City.

#### Term Expires 1940

R. K. Atkinson, Boys Club of New York, New York City.

Neva L. Boyd, Department of Sociology, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois.

Ella F. Harris, Council of Social Agencies, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

James H. Hubert, New York Urban League, New York City.

Roy Sorenson, National Council, Y. M. C. A.'s, Chicago, Illinois.

**Term Expires 1941**

- Joseph P. Anderson, Federation of Social Agencies, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.  
 Clara A. Kaiser, New York School of Social Work, New York City.  
 Glenford W. Lawrence, Chicago Commons, Chicago, Illinois.  
 W. T. McCullough, Welfare Federation of Cleveland, Cleveland, Ohio.  
 Helen Rowe, Butte, Montana.

**Term Expires 1942**

- Sanford Bates, Boys' Clubs of America, New York City.  
 Louis H. Blumenthal, Jewish Community Center, San Francisco, California.  
 Lucy P. Carner, Division on Education and Recreation, Council of Social Agencies, Chicago, Illinois.  
 Louise M. Clevenger, Community Chest, St. Paul, Minnesota.  
 Harold D. Meyer, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

**SECTION III—COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION**

- Chairman: Pierce Atwater, St. Paul Community Chest, St. Paul, Minnesota.  
 Vice-Chairman: Paul L. Benjamin, Council of Social Agencies, Buffalo, New York.

**Term Expires 1940**

- Ewan Clague, Bureau of Research and Statistics, Social Security Board, Washington, D. C.  
 Ruth Hill, Department of Public Welfare, New York City.  
 Russell H. Kurtz, Russell Sage Foundation, New York City.  
 George W. Rabinoff, Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, New York City.  
 Marietta Stevenson, American Public Welfare Association, Chicago, Illinois.

**Term Expires 1941**

- C. Raymond Chase, Community Federation, Boston, Massachusetts.  
 David Liggett, Minneapolis Council of Social Agencies, Minneapolis, Minnesota.  
 C. Whit Pfeiffer, Council of Social Agencies, Kansas City, Missouri.  
 Orville Robertson, Family Society of Seattle, Seattle, Washington.  
 Florence M. Warner, Connecticut College, New London, Connecticut.

**Term Expires 1942**

- George F. Davidson, Director of Social Welfare, Province of British Columbia, Victoria, B. C.  
 Robert P. Lane, Welfare Council of New York City, New York City.  
 Arch Mandel, Greater New York Fund, New York City.  
 Edward L. Ryerson, Jr., Chicago Council of Social Agencies, Chicago, Illinois.  
 Mary Stanton, Council of Social Agencies of Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California.

**SECTION IV—SOCIAL ACTION**

- Chairman: Wayne McMillen, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.  
 Vice-Chairman: Forrester B. Washington, Atlanta School of Social Work, Atlanta, Georgia.

**Term Expires 1940**

- Roger N. Baldwin, American Civil Liberties Union, New York City.  
 Paul H. Douglas, Department of Economics, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.  
 Rhoda Kaufman, Social Planning Council, Atlanta, Georgia.  
 Ralph J. Reed, Portland Community Chest, Portland, Oregon.

**Term Expires 1941**

- Charlotte Carr, Hull House, Chicago, Illinois.  
 Martha A. Chickering, Department of Economics, University of California, Berkeley, California.  
 Lea D. Taylor, Chicago Commons, Chicago, Illinois.  
 Conrad Van Hynning, Children's Service Center of Wyoming Valley, Wilkes Barre, Pennsylvania.  
 Mary van Kleeck, Department of Industrial Studies, Russell Sage Foundation, New York City.

**Term Expires 1942**

- J. P. Chamberlain, Columbia University, New York City.  
 Michael M. Davis, Committee on Research in Medical Economics, New York City.  
 The Right Reverend Francis J. Haas, School of Social Science, Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.  
 John A. Lapp, Chicago, Illinois.  
 Katharine F. Lenroot, Children's Bureau, U. S. Department of Labor, Washington, D. C.

**SECTION V—PUBLIC WELFARE ADMINISTRATION**

- Chairman: Ellen C. Potter, M.D., Department of Institutions and Agencies, Trenton, New Jersey.  
 Vice-Chairman: Fred K. Hoehler, American Public Welfare Association, Chicago, Illinois.

**Term Expires 1940**

- Frank Bane, Council of State Governments, Chicago, Illinois.  
 Wayne Coy, Administrative Assistant to U. S. High Commissioner, Manila, Philippine Islands.  
 William J. Ellis, State Department of Institutions and Agencies, Trenton, New Jersey.  
 Katharine F. Lenroot, Children's Bureau, U. S. Department of Labor, Washington, D. C.  
 Joseph L. Moss, Cook County Bureau of Public Welfare, Evanston, Illinois.

**Term Expires 1941**

- C. W. Areson, Domestic Relations Court, New York City.  
 Mary Irene Atkinson, Child Welfare Division, U. S. Children's Bureau, Washington, D. C.  
 Ruth O. Blakeslee, Bureau of Policy and Procedure, Public Assistance Division, Social Security Board, Washington, D. C.  
 Josephine C. Brown, Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

**Term Expires 1942**

- David C. Adie, New York State Department of Social Welfare, Albany, New York.  
 The Right Reverend Monsignor John O'Grady, School of Social Work, Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.  
 Ruth Taylor, Westchester County Department of Public Welfare, Valhalla, New York.  
 Charlotte Whitton, Canadian Welfare Council, Ottawa, Canada.  
 Elizabeth Wisner, School of Social Work of Tulane University, New Orleans, Louisiana.



**T**HE report of the Committee on Nominations for election at Grand Rapids as presented at Buffalo is as follows:

For President: Jane Hoey, Bureau of Public Assistance, Social Security Board, Washington, D. C.  
 For First Vice-President: Ellen C. Potter, M.D., Department of Institutions and Agencies, Trenton, New Jersey.  
 For Second Vice-President: Fred K. Hoehler, American Public Welfare Association, Chicago, Illinois.  
 For Third Vice-President: J. T. Clark, St. Louis Urban League, St. Louis, Missouri.

The following members of the National Conference of Social Work were nominated for the Executive Committee term to expire in 1943. (Seven to be elected.)

Pierce Atwater, St. Paul Community Chest, St. Paul, Minnesota.  
 Ruth O. Blakeslee, Bureau of Policy and Procedure, Public Assistance Division, Social Security Board, Washington, D. C.  
 Charlotte Carr, Hull House, Chicago, Illinois.  
 Joanna C. Colcord, Charity Organization Department, Russell Sage Foundation, New York City.  
 Loula Dunn, State Department of Public Welfare, Montgomery, Alabama.  
 Abraham Goldfeld, Lavanburg Foundation, New York City.  
 Kathleen Gorrie, Welfare Council of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.  
 Elmer R. Goudy, State Public Welfare Department, Portland, Oregon.  
 Hyman Kaplan, Jewish Family Service Agency, San Francisco, California.  
 Mrs. Val M. Keating, Division of Employment, Works Progress Administration, San Antonio, Texas.  
 H. L. Lurie, Bureau of Jewish Social Research, New York City.  
 Reverend Byran J. McEntegart, Division of Children, Catholic Charities, New York City.  
 Margaret E. Rich, Family Society of Allegheny County, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.  
 Josephine Roche, The President's Interdepartmental Committee to Coordinate Health and Welfare Activities, Denver, Colorado.  
 Ben M. Selekman, Associated Jewish Philanthropies of Boston, Boston, Massachusetts.  
 Anna Budd Ware, Associated Charities, Cincinnati, Ohio.

The following nominations were made by section nominating committees and approved at the section business sessions. The chairmen and vice-chairmen are nominated to serve for one year.

#### Section I—Social Case Work

Chairman: Leah Feder, Department of Social Work, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri.  
 Vice-Chairman: Lucille Nichols Austin, New York School of Social Work, New York City.

##### Committee Members

##### Term to Expire in 1943 (Five to be elected)

Marcella Farrar, School of Applied Social Sciences, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.  
 Irene Grant, Social Work Section, Veterans Administration, Washington, D. C.  
 Edith Hollaway, Family Service Association, Washington, D. C.  
 Alta Hoover, Child Welfare Services, Oregon State Relief Committee, Eugene, Oregon.  
 Prudence Kwiecien, Family Service Agency, San Francisco, California.  
 Beatrice Z. Levey, United Charities of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.  
 Ruth E. Lewis, Social Service Department, Washington University Clinics and Allied Hospitals, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri.  
 Mary E. Lucas, Family Welfare Association of America, New York City.  
 Alice Scott Nutt, Children's Bureau, U. S. Department of Labor, Washington, D. C.  
 Louise Silbert, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts.

#### Section II—Social Group Work

Chairman: Helen Hall, Henry Street Settlement, New York City.  
 Vice-Chairman: Clara Kaiser, New York School of Social Work, New York City.

##### Committee Members

##### Term to Expire 1943 (Five to be elected)

Louise Parrott Cochran, Y. W. C. A., New York City.  
 Harrison Elliott, Union Theological Seminary, New York City.  
 Neil Hansen, Chicago Congregational Union, Chicago, Illinois.  
 Robert M. Heining, Farnham Community House, Hartford, Connecticut.

Charles E. Hendry, Boys Clubs of America, New York City.  
 Mary Ellen Hubbard, Southwark Neighborhood House, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.  
 Joshua Lieberman, Camp Robinson Crusoe, Sturbridge, Massachusetts.  
 Margaret Murray, Girl Scouts, New York City.  
 Annie Cloe Watson, International Institute of the Y. W. C. A., San Francisco, California.  
 Margaret Williamson, Department of Study, National Board, Y. W. C. A.'s, New York City.

#### Section III—Community Organization

Chairman: Robert P. Lane, Welfare Council of New York City, New York City.  
 Vice-Chairman: Russell H. Kurtz, Russell Sage Foundation, New York City.

##### Committee Members

##### Term to Expire 1943. (Five to be elected)

Ralph H. Blanchard, Community Chests and Councils, New York City.  
 Arthur Dunham, University of Michigan, Detroit, Michigan.  
 Anita Eldridge, California Conference of Social Work, San Francisco, California.  
 Lyman S. Ford, Evanston Community Chest, Evanston, Illinois.  
 Benjamin Glassberg, Department of Outdoor Relief, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.  
 Joseph L. Moss, Cook County Bureau of Public Welfare, Evanston, Illinois.  
 William H. Stauffer, State Department of Public Welfare, Richmond, Virginia.  
 Josephine Strobe, Department of Rural Social Organization, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.  
 Margaret Woll, Division of Public Assistance, Department of Welfare, Frankfort, Kentucky.  
 Martha Wood, Children's Bureau, U. S. Department of Labor, Washington, D. C.

#### Section IV—Social Action

Chairman:  
 Ben M. Selekman, Associated Jewish Philanthropies of Boston, Boston, Massachusetts.  
 Lea D. Taylor, Chicago Commons, Chicago, Illinois.  
 Vice-Chairman:  
 George E. Bigge, Social Security Board, Washington, D. C.  
 Wayne McMillen, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.

##### Committee Members

##### Term to Expire 1943. (Five to be elected)

Mary Anderson, Women's Bureau, U. S. Department of Labor, Washington, D. C.  
 Roger N. Baldwin, American Civil Liberties Union, New York City.  
 Father Boland, State Labor Relations Board, New York City.  
 John S. Bradway, Law School, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina.  
 Linna E. Bresette, Department of Social Action, National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington, D. C.  
 Paul H. Douglas, Department of Economics, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.  
 Lavinia Engle, Social Security Board, Washington, D. C.  
 Rhoda Kaufman, Social Planning Council, Atlanta, Georgia.  
 John A. Kingsbury, Yonkers, New York.  
 H. L. Lurie, Bureau of Jewish Social Research, New York City.  
 Thomas Parran, United States Public Health Service, Washington, D. C.  
 Ralph J. Reed, Portland Community Chest, Portland, Oregon.

#### Section V—Public Welfare Administration

Chairman: Robert Lansdale, New York School of Social Work, New York City.  
 Vice-Chairman: Benjamin E. Youngdahl, State Board of Control, St. Paul, Minnesota.

##### Committee Members

##### Term to Expire 1943. (Five to be elected)

Charles H. Alspach, Social Security Board, Needham, Massachusetts.  
 Maud T. Barrett, Works Progress Administration, Washington, D. C.  
 Robert W. Beasley, Social Security Board, San Francisco, California.  
 Loula Dunn, State Department of Public Welfare, Montgomery, Alabama.  
 William Haber, National Coordinating Committee for Refugees, New York City.  
 Loa Howard, State Public Welfare Committee, Portland, Oregon.  
 Baird Middaugh, Department of Public Information, Social Security Board, Washington, D. C.  
 Clarence M. Pierce, Erie County Department of Social Welfare, Buffalo, New York.  
 Florence L. Sullivan, Children's Bureau, U. S. Department of Labor, Washington, D. C.  
 Ernest F. Witte, Graduate School of Social Work, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

adel-  
assa-

C. A.,  
board.

City,  
New

York

Fran-  
nois.  
ukee,  
vans-

Rich-  
Cor-  
ent of  
Labor,

Bos-

C.  
ois.

Labor,  
York

y.  
North  
atholic  
f Chi-

a.  
City.  
ington,  
gon.

Work,  
ontrol,

ssachu-  
ington,  
o, Cali-  
omery,  
fugees,  
Oregon.  
l Secu-  
elfare,  
ment of  
rsity of